

Modern Philology

VOLUME XIV

March 1917

NUMBER 11

THE GENESIS OF *RUY BLAS*

Almost a score of plays and memoirs have been suggested as the sources of *Ruy Blas*. It is not my purpose to add to this list, but to inquire how the first idea of the play came into Hugo's mind, what this idea was, and how it influenced his choice and use of sources. Before such questions can be answered, it is important to know what these sources were. I shall therefore first summarize the conclusions established by the scholarship of recent years in regard to them.

1. The historical background, the Spanish setting and manners, the character of the heroine, and certain minor incidents and persons are derived chiefly from the *Mémoires de la cour d'Espagne* by the Comtesse d'Aulnoy. This fact, already indicated by Auguste Vitu in his *Mille et une nuits du théâtre*,¹ has been thoroughly proved, with a detailed criticism of Hugo's methods of adapting history and geography to his needs, by M. Morel-Fatio in his *Etudes sur l'Espagne*.²

2. The main plot of vengeance and love, in which Salluste, in order to avenge himself, disguises his romantic lackey as a nobleman and seeks by the resulting love affair to compromise the queen, is apparently derived from a historical event, the marriage of Angelica Kauffmann to the impostor Horn, which was made known to Hugo by his friend Rabbe's article in the *Biographie universelle et portative*, and by Léon de Wailly's historical romance *Angelica Kauffmann*.

¹ Paris, 1890, VII, 97 f., lecture of April 2, 1879. Some details, though not so many as Vitu believed, may be due to Henri de Latouche's play, *la Reine d'Espagne* (Paris, 1831) which is itself modeled on the memoirs of Mme d'Aulnoy.

² Paris, 1888, pp. 177-244. He mentions a number of other works used by Hugo for names and financial details, among which the only one of importance is Vayrac's *Etat présent d'Espagne* (Paris, 1718).

This source has been established by M. Lanson in a recent article.¹ Formerly it had been generally supposed that the revenge plot came from Bulwer's *Lady of Lyons*. M. Lanson has shown that as the accounts of Angelica Kauffmann were much more readily accessible to Hugo than the *Lady of Lyons* was, and as the similarities existing in the two plays also occur in the novel, there is no reason to suppose that Hugo owed anything to his English contemporary.

3. In an excellent article,² "la Genèse d'un drame romantique: *Ruy Blas*," the most complete treatise on the sources of this play, M. Rigal, developing a suggestion of M. L. G. Pelissier, has established the fact that the political acts of Ruy Blas as ruler of Spain through the queen's favor and despite the opposition of the nobility, together with his downfall and the efforts of the lovers to save each other, were largely inspired by the *Struensee* of Gaillardet, a play acted at Paris in 1833.³

4. M. Rigal has also pointed out that the comic amplifications of the fourth act are derived from a farcical trilogy called *le Ramoneur Prince*, *Barogo*, and the *Mariage de Barogo*, probably the work of Maurice de Pompiigny. He reviews various other plays that have been called sources of *Ruy Blas*, but finds in them nothing of real importance.

The conclusion that M. Rigal draws from his investigation is that the play results, not, as the author would have us believe, from the development of an abstract idea, but from the meeting in Hugo's mind of the three principal sources.⁴ He does not tell us, however, how the idea of the play was first conceived. Indeed, one can scarcely go farther than he and M. Lanson have gone without the aid of testimony furnished by Hugo himself or by someone who learned from him how he first thought of writing the play. If we return a moment to Vitu, we shall find that he attempted to explain the play by this method. In his second lecture⁵ on *Ruy Blas* he

¹ "Victor Hugo et Angelica Kauffmann," *Revue d'histoire littéraire de la France*, 1915, pp. 392-401.

² *Revue d'histoire littéraire de la France*, 1913, pp. 753-88.

³ Rigal shows that Hugo may also have used the *Struensee* of Alexandre Duval, published at Paris in 1822, but he finds it far less important than Gaillardet's play. Certain suggestions may have come, as Vitu thinks, from Mme d'Aulnoy's account of Valenzuela, whose case will be discussed below. Cf. Mme d'Aulnoy, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 45 f., and Vitu, *op. cit.*

⁴ For Rigal, writing before Lanson, these are Mme d'Aulnoy's *Mémoires*, Gaillardet's *Struensee*, and Bulwer's *Lady of Lyons*.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, pp. 111, 112.

declares that while at first he did not dare guess the purely psychological point round which the poet's thought first developed, he now knows what this was through a friend in whom Hugo had confided the necessary information. This primitive idea was inspired, he says, by the passage of Rousseau's *Confessions* in which Jean Jacques describes his feelings while he believed himself to be in love with the daughter of the man he was serving as a lackey. "Au point de départ," exclaims Vitu, "voilà tout *Ruy Blas*!"

Now we may well question the value of this anecdote. We do not know who Vitu's friend was, nor have we Hugo's exact words. Even if we were sure that Hugo made this assertion, we could not attach much importance to an oral statement reported in 1879 about a source used in 1838. Moreover, it is impossible to find the plot of *Ruy Blas* in the simple episode of a lackey's sighing in vain for his mistress. There is no verbal likeness between the passage¹ and any part of *Ruy Blas*. Even if we admit that Hugo learned from Rousseau's account of his feeling for Mlle de Breil the charm of such a love affair, we have still to find a central idea that could give rise to the plot as we know it. In view of the lack of authority for the anecdote and the small amount of information it contains, it is not surprising that most scholars have neglected Vitu's theory in studying the sources of the play. But is there no direct evidence, better authenticated than this, that will tell us how the play was conceived? I have found such evidence in an unexpected quarter.

When Hugo returned to Paris after his exile, he left behind in Guernesey certain papers which, sold for a few shillings during a house-cleaning, came ultimately into the possession of Samuel Davey, a London expert in autographs, who bound them under the title *Journal de l'Exil*. They were then examined by M. Octave Uzanne, who published the results of his investigation in *Scribner's Magazine* for November, 1892,² and in a brochure that appeared at Paris the same year.³ According to Uzanne, the manuscripts should be called *The Table-Talk of Victor Hugo at Guernesey*. He identifies

¹ Cf. Rousseau, *Confessions*, Part I, Book III, pp. 162 f., in the edition of Thomine et Fortié (Paris, 1823, 1824).

² Pp. 558-76.

³ *Une curiosité littéraire. Excursion à travers un MS. inédit de V. Hugo: Les propos de table du poète en exil.* Paris: Administration de l'Art et de l'Idée, rue St. Benoît, 4^e. The anecdote is given on pp. 44 and 45.

them as the diary of Hugo's daughter Adèle,¹ kept from July, 1852, into the year 1856. As he puts it, the writer must have amused herself "by noting every evening the detailed conversations—literary, artistic, political, economical, aesthetic, and dramatic—held every day during the repasts of the Titan in exile." The fact that Victor Hugo's hand is visible in numerous corrections suggests that the poet read and verified his daughter's manuscript. Uzanne declares that Hugo's executors, Meurice and Vacquerie, acknowledged the "authenticity of these dialogues and anecdotes." Among them is recorded the following conversation on the nature of inspiration, which took place probably in 1854:

Auguste Vacquerie. I should believe that man is nothing more than an instrument on which the spirits play, that the phenomenon of inspiration, for example, is produced not by the labor and the creation of man but by an idea, a sort of spirit that takes its place in the brain of man. Thus, in my own case, this is so true that I have been ten years unsuccessful in finding some idea, which finally came to me all at once, at the moment when I least expected it. . . .

Victor Hugo. Inspiration comes to me in exactly the opposite way. There is in all my work not a single idea, not one line, that I have not sought for; not a single word that I have not meditated on. Thus, do you know how the idea of *Ruy Blas* came to me? I wanted to represent a minister invested with absolute power, the undisputed ruler of a great kingdom; when he has arrived at the highest degree of power, one day, amid his courtiers and his flatterers, there enters to him an unknown man who commands him as his master. That is the idea from which *Ruy Blas* came.

That such a scene appealed to Hugo as a suitable foundation for a play will surprise no one familiar with his love of antithesis and a sudden reversal of fortune. The contrast between the apparent and the real power of the two men in the scene described illustrates one of Hugo's commonest characteristics. The fall at the moment of greatest joy recalls Hernani forced to take poison just after his marriage, or Triboulet finding that he has killed his daughter just as he is gloating over his supposed vengeance upon her seducer.

The fact that Hugo gives this scene a very important position in *Ruy Blas* and treats it much as in the reported conversation, also confirms the truth of the anecdote. The third act shows Ruy Blas as absolute ruler of Spain. After a scene with the governing nobles,

¹ He originally supposed them to be the work of François Victor Hugo, but in an article which appeared only last September he states that Meurice had told him that the diary was written by Adèle. See the *Intermédiaire des Chercheurs et des Curieux*, September, 1916, cols. 118-21. My attention was called to this article by Professor A. Schinz.

whom he orders about, a scene with the queen, who admits her love for him, and a monologue of joy, a man wrapped in a great mantle enters, marches up to him, and forces him to accept him as his master.

Finally, in *Victor Hugo raconté*¹ we are told that Hugo originally intended making this third act the first of his play:

Ruy Blas, premier ministre, duc d'Olmedo, tout-puissant, aimé de la reine; un laquais entre, donne des ordres à ce tout-puissant, lui fait fermer une fenêtre et ramasser son mouchoir.² Tout se serait expliqué après. L'auteur, en y réfléchissant, aima mieux commencer par le commencement, faire un effet de gradation plutôt qu'un effet d'étonnement, et montrer d'abord le ministre en ministre et le laquais en laquais.

This quotation confirms the statement that this scene represented the germ of the tragedy. Note that if the scene were acted at the beginning of the play, Salluste would be as unknown to the audience as the intruder of whom Hugo had first thought. He was obliged to give up this detail of his plan when he moved the scene into the third act.

The original idea of the piece is not, then, an act of revenge, or the love affair of an ill-assorted couple. It is rather the sudden fall from power of a prime minister at the command of an apparently insignificant person. Now this idea came to Hugo, as Rigal has shown, from the *Struensee* of Gaillardet. In both plays a reforming prime minister is deprived of his power shortly after a love scene between him and the queen, following a scene in which, for the good of the people, he has lorded it over a privy council of corrupt nobles. In both plays the fall from power is sudden and is caused by an apparently powerless person, for *Struensee* is arrested by Banner,³ whom, only a few scenes before, he had forced to resign from the council.

Thus supplied with his first idea, Hugo enlarged and complicated his plan by introducing from the story of Angelica Kauffmann the theme of a noble's avenging himself upon a woman by means of an amorous lackey. This would not only add interesting and picturesque details to the original conception, but it would explain the hero's obedience to the villain's command without the introduction

¹ *Œuvres complètes de Victor Hugo* (Paris, Hetzel), II, 392.

² This is not strictly accurate, for we know that the four lines in which Salluste orders Ruy Blas to pick up his handkerchief were added after the original draught was made. Cf. Pierre Dauze, *Revue Biblio-iconographique* (Paris), July-October, 1898, pp. 389-94.

³ Act IV, scene 14.

of royal authority. It was, perhaps, before this addition that Hugo planned to begin his play with the scene of the hero's downfall. It may well have been the difficulty of making the spectators understand such a scene when the more complex plot was planned, added to the already existing need for interesting them in the characters and for moving rather than surprising them, that forced him to postpone this scene till the middle of the third act.

The question of time and place, of a historic background and local color, would now be of great importance. Hugo's interest in Spain is well known. He may have been led to Mme d'Aulnoy, as Morel-Fatio suggests, by the popularity of the Spanish seventeenth century in the period immediately preceding the composition of *Ruy Blas*; or, perhaps, while seeking a case which resembled that of Struensée, but occurred less recently and in a larger and more picturesque country than Denmark, he ran across or remembered Mme d'Aulnoy's account of Valenzuela, the Spanish adventurer of humble origin, who, like Ruy Blas, a poet and a page, if not a lackey, became ruler of Spain by the grace of Queen Maria Anna, widow of Philip IV. Reading further in Mme d'Aulnoy's *Mémoires* Hugo learned of Charles II and his two queens, one of whom furnished him with the character, the other with the name of his heroine. From these memoirs he made most of his direct borrowings. Additions from Pompigny and other writers followed readily enough.

However much may be conjectural in this theory of the process by which *Ruy Blas* was composed, it seems safe to conclude that the original idea of the play was that of a minister's fall from power under very dramatic circumstances, rather than a story of vengeance and love; that, as Rigal holds to be generally true of Hugo, this thought came first to him as a picture rather than an abstract notion; that Gaillardet's *Struensée* supplied the first suggestion, the story of Angelica Kauffmann an important part of the plot; that less than ever is there a reason for seeing any influence of the *Lady of Lyons* on the play; and that the *Mémoires* of Mme d'Aulnoy, though extensively followed, were not employed till after other works had outlined the plot in the author's mind.

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

THE BRIEF-NARRATIVE ART OF THÉOPHILE GAUTIER

When Maxime Du Camp affirms¹ that Gautier is less of a *romancier* than a *conteur*, he is attempting to distinguish between these as between invention and imagination, arguing that whereas a *roman* is composed objectively, upon a deliberate plan, a *conte* or a *nouvelle* is subjective and spontaneous. This distinction, carried to its logical consequences, means that in novels the writer guides the narrative, in brief tales the narrative guides the writer, a reduction to the absurd even if limited to Gautier. For the structural unity of *la Morte amoureuse* is as voluntary as that of *le Capitaine Fracasse*, and vastly superior to that of such novels as *Partie carrée*. Du Camp is manifestly correct in assuming that many of Gautier's briefer tales are the result of musing over adventures, generally erotic, of which the author imagines himself the hero, and there is a degree of reason in his remark that "c'est parce qu'elles ont été un épisode de sa vie intellectuelle que ses nouvelles sont simples, presque sans incidents, émues néanmoins et communiquant l'émotion dont elles palpitent."² But this subjectivity is not in itself an adequate explanation of the peculiar singleness of effect of some of the stories, and the question remains by what narrative methods Gautier achieved this.

The ultimate solution should include an appraisal of Gautier's importance in the development of brief fiction in France, but this can be attempted only after such a survey of the entire field as no one has yet made. My immediate purpose is to examine Gautier's tales for themselves and to discover whether he evolved a type or types of any narrative distinction.

In a group of the earlier stories, notably in *la Morte amoureuse* (1836), his methods are comparable to Poe's, although there is no likelihood that at this period Gautier was acquainted with the writings of the American.

Whoever analyzes *la Morte amoureuse* will perceive that it fulfils the short-story requirements later expounded by Poe and so diligently

¹ *Théophile Gautier* (Paris, 1890), pp. 147-52.

² *Ibid.*, p. 149.

studied by his followers and his critics.¹ Gautier chooses for a theme the *liaison* of a priest and a female vampire and sets out, as the short-story adepts now do, "to produce a single narrative effect with the greatest economy of means that is consistent with the utmost emphasis."² His devices for procuring complete harmony are legion. The point of view is constant, for the whole experience is related in the first person by the victim. The initial sentences tend to the outbringing of the preconceived effect, to sounding that note of the uncanny which is constantly to be maintained: "Vous me demandez, frère, si j'ai aimé; oui. C'est une histoire singulière et terrible, et, quoique j'aie soixante-six ans, j'ose à peine remuer le cendre de ce souvenir."³ The entire first paragraph, summing up the indelible impression made upon the priest, is in the same key, and throughout the tale the note rings out, ever lugubrious.⁴ Except for supernumeraries entirely inconspicuous, there are only three characters, the vampire, the priest Romuault, and a brother-priest whose attempts to offer guidance form an essential part of the action. In the matter of descriptions, tabooed in the short-story as foreign to its essence, Gautier, who is notoriously fond of the picturesque, has restrained himself to an unusual degree. The events are simple and decisive, and at turning-points in the story attention is fastened upon the stage of development reached by a terse summarizing phrase.⁵ Suspense is brought skilfully to a head by the cumulation of manifestations made to the priest by Clarimonde. When Romuault is summoned to the unfamiliar château, the promptness with which he realizes that he is to see his lady is not only natural but a factor—one of a score—in securing swift progress. The ending is as direct

¹ For an abridged short-story bibliography, cf. my article on "Balzac and the Short-Story," *Modern Philology*, XII, 71, note 3. The famous statement of Poe, part of which is quoted in that note, was written in 1842. The short-story character of *la Mort amoureuse* has already been pointed out by Professor Baldwin, *American Short Stories* (New York, 1909), Introduction, p. 33. In the present article I shall use the term "short-story" only in the restricted American sense.

² Hamilton, *Materials and Methods of Fiction* (New York, 1908), p. 173.

³ *Nouvelles* (Paris, 1871), p. 261.

⁴ Observe the repetition of the idea of a nightmare (*ibid.*, pp. 266, 275, 289); of the apostrophe of Clarimonde: "Malheureux! qu'as-tu fait?" (pp. 267, 268, 295); of the motif of a single fatal glance: "un seul regard . . . jeté sur une femme" (p. 261), "pour avoir levé une seule fois le regard sur une femme" (p. 274), "ne regardez jamais une femme . . . il suffit d'une minute" (p. 295).

⁵ Pp. 263, 268, 288.

as the beginning: the *liaison* is broken, Clarimonde bids the priest farewell, "elle se dissipa dans l'air . . . et je ne la revis plus."¹ There follows a paragraph of a few lines which sound for the last time the note of the awfulness of the experience and is simply long enough to save the termination from being brusque, to put the needed period to the whole.

La Morte amoureuse was prepared for Balzac's *Chronique de Paris*,² and Balzac himself had written a little earlier³ several tales of salient short-story characteristics, yet neither he nor Gautier in any way suggest that they were aware of the temporary similarity of their narrative processes. A similarity there is, however, and not in the case of *la Morte amoureuse* alone; other stories written by Gautier within a few years preceding 1836 approach the same standard and may be considered tentative efforts at the form finally achieved in 1836.

The first of these is *la Cafetière* (1831). A young man, Théodore, staying at a country house, has a singular adventure during the night, and, like the priest Romuald, he tells of the experience himself. Objects in his room come to life, a porcelain coffee-pot thumps its way from table to hearth, portraits become animated and dance, and the youth, perceiving a charming girl without a partner, joins her. At dawn the spell is broken, the girl falls to the floor, and Théodore, rushing to pick her up, finds only the pieces of the coffee-pot. The exposition is of the briefest, the narrative progress is swift, the attention is focused, first upon the weird group of figures in the room and then, sharply, upon the principal figure, Angéla.⁴ A single tone, suggesting the weird and the tragic, prevails as in *la Morte amoureuse*, and is last sounded in the final words of the tale when the hero expresses his—somewhat callow—despair with the remark: "Je venais de comprendre qu'il n'y avait plus pour moi de bonheur sur la terre!"⁵ In a tentative version of the first part of the story,

¹ P. 295.

² Lovenjoul, *Histoire des œuvres de Théophile Gautier* (Paris, 1887), No. 130. The story was divided between two issues of the *Chronique de Paris*. Apparently Gautier had no thought of the advantage which, according to Poe, results from a single, uninterrupted presentation.

³ Cf. p. 136, note 1.

⁴ In 1852 the story was published under the title *Angéla* (Lovenjoul, *op. cit.*, No. 45).

⁵ *Les Jeunes-France* (Paris: Charpentier), p. 261. In this edition the story is dated, erroneously, 1833.

reproduced from the manuscript by Lovenjoul,¹ there are copious descriptions of no narrative value, and a more cumbersome exposition, and in the fact that this version was rejected there may be a sign of a conscious move to attain a higher degree of unity.

Onuphrius (1832) consists of a series of adventures of a young man who gradually becomes insane. The events are related with remarkable imaginative power and are somewhat varied, too varied no doubt to admit classification of the story with the Poe type. But the basic unity is complete. *Onuphrius* has something in common with *le Horla* by Maupassant, a tale worthy of Poe at his best, resembling it closely enough to prove short-story characteristics, differing sufficiently to indicate short-story defects. The experiences in *le Horla* are as diversified, but there results a high degree of unity from the fact that the illusion of the patient is a single one, while that of Onuphrius, except for the recurring hallucination of the demon with the ruby on his finger, varies. The climacteric development in *le Horla* is superior, and the attention is more completely focused on the man and his obsession. *Le Horla* is told in the first person, whereas with Gautier, although the point of view is constant, the third person is used, with consequent diminution, it may be argued, of intensity.²

Three other products of the years immediately preceding *la Morte amoureuse* merit a word. Two of them are hardly more than anecdotes. The first, published by Lovenjoul,³ who without vouching altogether for its authenticity thinks it may be the first piece of fiction ever composed by Gautier (March 24, 1831), is the account of the experience of a young Frenchman in Egypt, compelled to seek the hospitality of a Bedouin camp and discovering that he has eaten of a gazelle roasted over blazing mummies. The next is the story, covering some eight pages in *Sous la Table* (1833),⁴ concerning a youth and a *grisette*. The episode is too trivial to warrant serious consideration, yet, its essential narrative structure alone considered—and it is

¹ Lovenjoul, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 16–20.

² The ending of the first edition, quoted by Lovenjoul, *op. cit.*, No. 56, is more abrupt and less artistic than that of the *Jeunes-France* volume.

³ *Op. cit.*, I, pp. 8–11.

⁴ *Les Jeunes-France*, pp. 11–18.

sufficiently developed to be said to have a structure—the singleness of effect is achieved by a process comparable to Poe's. In the third, *Omphale* (1834), the narrative current is swift and steady. Omphale is a lady portrayed on an old piece of tapestry in a young man's room. She comes to life and loves him, but the affair is interrupted by the young man's uncle, who removes the tapestry. The account of the subsequent effort of the youth to regain the tapestry is not, however, acceptable from the short-story point of view, and, a more vital matter, the chief interest is in the picturesque setting, as the subtitle, *histoire rococo*, suggests.

These of course do not constitute all of the brief tales written by Gautier between 1831, at the beginning of his career, and 1836, but the others are nondescript, and some of them, such as *le Bol de punch*, a picture of a revel, and *Daniel Jovard*, a character sketch, are narrative only in name. The point is that during this period Gautier write one genuine short-story and other pieces approaching the type. As has been suggested, it is not safe to posit in this group any influence of Poe, who was only beginning to write at this period and who was not known in France, at least in translation, until the forties.¹ The truth seems to be that Gautier is one of several authors who were at that time creating in France, independent of foreign models, a type the identity of which with Poe's is at once fortuitous and complete²—and which I label short-story for want of authority to call it anything more distinctive. But after 1836 Gautier writes no more narratives of this form; his methods continue to develop, and, oddly enough, by the time it may be assumed that Gautier was well acquainted with Poe, he is producing stories of a stamp distinct from the American's.

The prime difference is in degree of compression. Superlative concision, the *sine qua non* of the Poe type, is no longer achieved or

¹ According to Retinger, *le Conte fantastique dans le Romantisme français* (Paris, 1909), p. 33, note, *The Murders in the rue Morgue* appeared anonymously as early as 1841. Cf. Lauvrière, *Poe* (Paris, 1904), p. 644, note 2; p. 276; Morris, *Cooper et Poe d'après la critique française du dix-neuvième siècle* (Paris, 1912), pp. 80, 203.

² Professor Baldwin, *op. cit.*, Introduction, p. 33, pointing to the dates of *la Mort amoureuse* (1836) and of *Berenice* (1835), says: "Remarkable as is the coincident appearance in Paris and in Richmond of a new literary form, it remains a coincidence." Cf. Canby, *Study of the Short Story* (New York, 1913), p. 45; "The work of their [the American writers'] French contemporaries . . . represents a parallel, not a derivative movement."

sought. What this means in actual practice will become evident upon inspection of the significant examples.

The tendency is already manifest in *Une Nuit de Cléopâtre* (1838). A young Egyptian, so enamored of Cleopatra that he dares penetrate to her bath, is there discovered by the capricious queen, who accepts him as her lover with the condition that the next morning he shall die. At daybreak he pays the penalty. This would be an admirable nucleus for a short-story, and it is not difficult to imagine how the theme would be treated. The bounds of the above summary would be respected, the action would hardly begin before the capture of the youth at the bath, and would cease with the administration of the poison. In the latter case Gautier has, unconsciously, met the short-story requirement; his termination, according to that convention, is impeccable, possessing even that unexpected twist so sought after by the American twentieth-century writer, often with a resultant artificiality—though the turn which Gautier gives the narrative development is altogether probable as well as interesting: at the crucial moment Cleopatra wavers and considers preventing her lover from drinking the potion, when the unlooked-for announcement of the arrival of Mark Antony precipitates the catastrophe. The story at this point moves as rapidly as Poe's followers say it must. But here only. Gautier does not introduce the episode of the bath until he reaches the fifth of the six chapters. His preparation is leisurely. In the first chapter we learn that Cleopatra is bored, in the second this theme is elaborated and we have a first glimpse of the lover, in the third the lover becomes active to the extent of sending Cleopatra a message by an arrow, in the fourth we learn that Cleopatra is no longer bored and that the youth contemplates further activity. This easy-going preliminary, the frequent changes in viewpoint and in place, and above all the copious descriptions, are quite contrary to short-story practice.

In the case of *le Roi Candaule* (1844), Gautier appears to have been of two minds. He was evidently tempted at the outset to yield to the charm of the picturesque, and then became interested in the development of the action and gave over the static for the kinetic. An admirable narrative is developed about a central point, the inspection of the queen's beauty. The author seems to have taken,

for structural purposes, the point of view of Gyges.¹ At the beginning it is not apparent that the young captain is to play an important rôle, for the first chapter consists almost entirely of an elaborate description of the marriage of King Candaules and Nyssia, but, as the story moves on, more and more light is centered upon Gyges, the descriptions which, from the point of view of narration, obstruct, become less and less frequent, and after an extremely leisurely start the action becomes rapid. The preparation for the climax is adroit. It is necessary to explain concisely, when the crisis approaches, how it happens that Candaules wishes to have another man behold his wife's charms, and this is the more easily done since it has already been casually developed that he is a person of uncommon stamp and especially that his appreciation of beauty may be that of the artist as much as that of the lover. The keenness of vision which enables Nyssia to discover the eyes of Gyges as he looks into the chamber from his hiding-place is suggested early in the story. Surely such arrangement of details demonstrates what Maxime Du Camp would deny, the exercise of inventive powers by the *conteur*.² The termination of the story, after cleverly maintained suspense, is swift; climax and end are almost simultaneous. The murder done, the problem solved, a brief final paragraph gives a last glance at the central theme: "le nouveau roi se maintint sur le trône de Lydie, qu'il occupa pendant de longues années, vécut heureux et ne fit voir sa femme à personne, sachant trop ce qu'il en coûtait."³

Somewhat parallel in structure is *Arria Marcella* (1852).⁴ A young Frenchman, at a museum in Naples, is moved by a relic of

¹ The following is a summary of the chapters from this angle: (i) it transpires that Gyges, by a rare chance, has seen the queen unveiled before her marriage; (ii) Gyges is the chosen confidant of the king as regards her beauty; (iii) Gyges sees her in the chamber; (iv) he is summoned to the queen to avenge her; (v) he wins her.

Le Roi Candaule is clearly enough an adaptation of Herodotus' story of Gyges (I. 8-12), itself an excellent example of narrative economy; the principal incidents in Gautier are those related by the Greek, and several items of the conversation between Gyges and Candaules and of that between Gyges and the queen are almost exactly reproduced. But Gautier's elaboration of the theme remains his own.

² Cf. Taylor, "The Short Story in France, 1800-1900," *Edinburgh Review*, July, 1913, p. 144: "Mérimée, Gautier, Flaubert, exercised, however covertly, an art of composition; they disposed their incidents in due order of sequence; they arranged their figures with an aesthetic sense of perspective, prepared and suspended their crises, and held the balance of accent and emphasis."

³ *Nouvelles*, p. 419.

⁴ Lafcadio Hearn (*One of Cleopatra's Nights*, etc. [New York: Brentano, 1906], pp. 385-88) thinks that Gautier may have found the inspiration for *Arria Marcella* in an

Pompeii, a mass of ashes which has hardened about the form of a beautiful woman perishing in the destruction of the city. With imagination stirred by a daylight inspection of the ruins he returns there the same night, finds the conditions of eighteen hundred years ago restored, encounters the lady in question, and is welcomed by her, when her Christian father steps in, berates his daughter, and destroys the hallucination.¹ *Arria Marcella* is composed with no regard for the short-story principle that "the narrative must move, move, move furiously each action and every speech pointing directly toward the unknown climax,"² yet it is carefully organized in the interest of unity, with graduated and skilful focusing of the attention upon the heroine and artful alternation of suspense and swift advance. The exposition and the action proper are amalgamated by the author's conception that Arria is already acquainted with the passion of the young man and knows, by a weird interchange of the centuries, that he has admired her in the museum.³

Common to these later stories is a feature already observed in *la Morte amoureuse*, the deliberate insertion of forward-pointing remarks which serve to emphasize the central theme. The ultimate and sinister achievement of Gyges is already faintly suggested, at the very outset of *le Roi Candaule*, in the musings of the young captain: "il songeait aux enivrements de la toute-puissance, au bonheur . . . de poser le diadème sur la tête de la plus belle," "en effet, c'était bien sur ce front [de Nyssia] qu'il eût voulu poser le diadème," "l'amour qu'il éprouvait pour Nyssia lui causait une secrète terreur."⁴ The strange adventure of the hero of *Arria Marcella* is foreshadowed in the searching glance of his companion, and in his own first impressions: "Octavien . . . semblait plus touché que ses insoucians compagnons du sort de ces trépassés de deux mille ans," "Les phrases banales du guide causèrent une vive émotion à Octavien."⁵

old Greek ghost story, and quotes Michelet's version of this. In any case it is clear that Gautier's narrative methods are his own.

¹ Observe how frequently the basic plot of a *liaison* interrupted by a third person recurs (*Omphale*, *la Morte amoureuse*, *le Pied de momie*, even, in a sense, *Une Nuit de Cléopâtre* and *le Roi Candaule*).

² Canby, "Free Fiction," *Atlantic Monthly*, July, 1915, p. 61. Professor Canby urges his compatriots not to be fettered by such rules.

³ The period to the story, the final sentence, deftly enhances the unity.

⁴ *Nouvelles*, pp. 364, 365, 365, respectively.

⁵ *Romans et Contes* (Paris: Charpentier), pp. 272, 280, 282, respectively.

Occasional emphatic sentences, such as the statement in *Une Nuit de Cléopâtre*, "il s'était juré . . . qu'il serait l'amant de Cléopâtre . . . ne fût-ce qu'une nuit . . . dût-il lui en coûter son corps et son âme,"¹ are at once a prophecy and a summary, and the progress of a story is often epitomized, with a resultant and deliberately attained narrative unity, as in Gyges' résumé of the course of events: "Un hasard lui avait fait connaître sa beauté murée à tous les yeux, entre tant de princes et de satrapes elle avait épousé précisément Candaule, le roi qu'il servait, et, par un caprice étrange qu'il ne pouvait s'empêcher de trouver presque fatal, ce roi venait faire, à lui Gygès, des confidences sur cette créature mystérieuse que personne n'approchait. . . ."²

These features become less conspicuous in three narratives of later date, much longer than those so far under discussion and yet possessed of a similar unity distinct from that of the novel. The evolution appears to be steady, from a narrative organization strictly limited, with unity consciously emphasized, to one of broader scope.

The theme of *Avatar* (1856) is a reincarnation and its consequences. Octave de Saville almost despairs at the hopelessness of his love for the Countess Labinski, who adores her husband. Thanks to the occult science of an uncanny physician, Octave's soul is transferred to the husband's body, and the husband's soul is incorporated in his. But the lover finds success as impossible as before, and the souls at his behest are being retransferred when his flies off into space, and the doctor occupies his body. The progress of the story is as steady and unhurried as that of *Arria Marcella*, but the attention is not equally concentrated. In *Arria Marcella* the single interest is in the relations of the youth and the girl of Pompeii; in *Avatar* the interest is for a considerable period in the relations of Octave and the lady, but later, when this situation is solved, much space is devoted to the resultant fate of the young man. And since, in the nature of the situation, the reader would be almost as interested in the effects of the reincarnation on the husband as in its effects on the lover, there is a considerable discussion of this. The remark of Gautier, summing up the case for Octave, "Âme obscurément sublime, il ne savait qu'aimer et mourir,"³ may be regarded as the

¹ *Nouvelles*, p. 345.

² *Ibid.*, p. 387.

³ *Romans et Contes*, p. 126.

nucleus of the tale, yet when the interest turns away from Octave the author does not hold it in check, he does not impose an adventurous unity. The theme of *Arria* calls for development within a small circle, that of *Avatar* occupies a relatively large one.¹

Avatar is promptly followed by another story of the same order, *Jettatura* (1856). Here Gautier unfolds the consequences of the Neapolitan superstition of the evil eye when it fastens itself upon a young foreigner in love with a girl threatened with tuberculosis. At every point, in composing the tale, he has kept this situation in mind. His methods as usual are leisurely, but the narrative is held true to its course. The technique is remote from that of the short-story. The beginning, where, before the hero is introduced, there are five pages of easy-going description of the approach to Naples and some humorous animadversions on British travelers, recalls the lack of restraint of the novel.² Yet there is a deliberate and successful attempt to secure singleness of effect. Step by step the theme of the evil eye of Paul d'Aspremont is developed. The thought that there is a peculiar and pernicious power in his gaze is kept constantly before the reader. At first there are only mild suggestions. Then disasters which take place in the presence of Paul and which, the reader is gradually persuaded, may be due to the peculiar power of his eye, accumulate. At length, at a point where his gaze seems to produce catastrophes in rapid succession, Paul first hears the epithet *jettatore!* His concern over his strange situation and especially over its possible consequences for Alicia grows rapidly until the climax. Preparation for the one critical situation and the development of that situation, or in other words a climactic elaboration of the power of Paul's eye and then an account of the result when this power is concentrated upon Alicia, such is Gautier's method.³

¹ The twelve sections of the story, as it appears in book form, are presumably the twelve units of its serial publication (cf. Lovenjoul, *op. cit.*, No. 1400). Here, as well as elsewhere, Gautier deals successfully with the exigencies of the *feuilleton* system; his division into short chapters is highly logical and his final sentences sometimes epitomize with the succinctness of the short-story termination, sometimes point forward to the next stage of the tale in a way that welds the sections together.

² There are other suggestions of novel technique. Cf. p. 161, where Gautier returns to the exposition by relating events that antedate the action of the story. Such retrogression is rare in tales where a high degree of unity is the desideratum (although it is found in Stevenson's *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*). Cf. pp. 252-55, where the author introduces supernumerary characters of somewhat meager interest as exemplifying the idiosyncrasies of the British and of almost no usefulness in advancing the narrative.

³ Gautier started to cast *Jettatura* in verse, and several fragments of his work exist (cf. Lovenjoul, *op. cit.*, No. 2306). The beginning of the narrative is more direct, the tone more sinister, than in the prose form.

Spirite (1865), one of his last pieces of fiction, closes the series of distinctive tales I am here considering. It is of particular interest in that it was written under the influence of Poe,¹ with whose work the author was now thoroughly familiar,² and yet, as regards structure, is closer to the *Avatar* type than to *la Morte amoureuse*.

Once more, maximum compression is not sought. The essential theme, the relations of Guy de Malivert and the spirit of a woman who had already loved him in the flesh, without his knowing it, is given due prominence, yet Gautier does not refrain from dealing with the immediate ramifications. In addition to Malivert and *Spirite* two characters play rôles of some importance, Madame d'Ymbercourt, the flesh-and-blood rival, and the Baron de Feroë, a mystic who is able to explain to Guy the manifestations of his intangible mistress. Both are required in Gautier's manipulation of the subject, the first as a foil, the second as an interpreter. The scene is allowed to shift, the point of view changes. The fourteenth chapter, wherein the main issue waits while the jealousy of Madame d'Ymbercourt is healed by *Spirite*, would be considered by Poe an unpardonable interpolation.³ Even from a more liberal point of view certain features may be considered to clog the narrative, for example the long description by *Spirite*, who is recounting her mortal life, of the ball where she did not dance with Malivert.⁴ On the other hand, it is clear that Gautier felt the need of a certain degree of narrative concision: when the situation becomes critical the story is made to move rapidly, the writer comes promptly to the essential,⁵ and once he remarks: "Il est inutile de décrire avec détail les impressions de voyage de Malivert; ce serait sortir du cadre de ce récit."⁶

¹ Cf. Retinger, *op. cit.*, pp. 61, 77. Gautier mentions Poe in the course of the story (pp. 4, 33-34).

² I find no reference by Gautier to Poe earlier than 1858 (cf. *Portraits contemporains* [Paris, 1898], p. 52). From this time forward allusions are frequent, as if Gautier had suddenly become aware of the American, perhaps through Baudelaire's translations (1856). In his article on Baudelaire, Gautier quotes, without comment, a remark by Poe which contains in essence the latter's short-story theory (*Portraits et souvenirs littéraires* [Paris, 1892], p. 191).

³ Furthermore, Gautier has not, in the Poe manner, "deliberately preconceived" the whole story, to judge from the following (*Vacances du Lundi* [Paris, 1907], p. 75): "nous voilà installé au sein d'un doux et charmant loisir, cherchant sous les grands marronniers la fin de *Spirite*."

⁴ Perhaps the explanation at the close of this description may be considered faintly apologetic (*Spirite* [Paris, 1907], p. 134).

⁵ Cf. *ibid.*, p. 138.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 218. Observe, however, that a page of description follows.

This note of conscious construction is rare in Gautier, either in his stories or in his critical writing. If we now examine the latter, it will become evident that he can hardly be said to have, in the case of fiction, any doctrine.

Even as regards terminology he is careless. He called *Spirite* a *nouvelle*. *Avatar* and *Jettatura* first appeared as *contes*,¹ but they are the longest stories, and stand at the head, in the subsequent collection entitled *Romans et Contes* (1863). In his autobiography, referring to his activities in the field of fiction, he writes: "Sans être romancier de profession je n'en ai pas moins bâclé, en mettant à part les nouvelles, une douzaine de romans: *les Jeunes-France*, *Mâdemoiselle de Maupin*, *Fortunio*, *les Roués innocents*, *Militona*, *la Belle Jenny*, *Jean et Jeannette*, *Avatar*, *Jettatura*, *le Roman de la momie*, *Spirite*, *le Capitaine Fracasse*."² Here is a list which includes novels, tales that approach the short-story type, and tales that bear another stamp; they have in common merely the fact that they are relatively long. There is apparently no distinction between *roman* and *nouvelle*, unless it be one of length, in the following remark: "Il y a douze ou quinze ans, M. Jules Janin publia, dans *la Revue des Deux Mondes*, une nouvelle d'une centaine de pages—on n'avait pas encore inventé, en ce temps-là, les romans qui n'en finissent pas—une nouvelle, disons-nous, intitulée *le Piédestal*."³ And certainly little difference between *nouvelle* and *conte* is recognized by Gautier when he uses the two words in the same sentence of the same story.⁴

A specific problem of narration is discussed by him to some purpose in his article on Karr. Of the digressions in the novels of the latter he writes:

¹ Lovenjoul, *op. cit.*, Nos. 1400, 1421.

² *Portraits contemporains*, p. 13.

³ *Histoire de l'art dramatique en France* (Paris, 1859), VI, 5. *Le Piédestal* was published in 1832, not in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* but in the *Revue de Paris*. Janin, in the course of the story, makes a significant distinction between *nouvelle* and *roman* (XLIII, 103): "Ici si je faisais un roman et non pas une histoire, j'aurais un bien beau sujet de développements de mœurs. J'arrangerais à loisir mon récit, le conduisant en habile écuyer à travers toutes les difficultés du terrain, changeant souvent ma voie. . . .

"Mais il n'en est pas de la *nouvelle* comme du roman. La nouvelle, c'est une course au clocher. . . . On va toujours au galop, on ne connaît pas d'obstacles; on traverse le buisson d'épines, on franchit le fossé, on brise le mur, on se brise les os, on va tant que va son histoire." In performance, Janin proves somewhat irresponsible. His composition is lax. But the metaphor brings out effectively the essential directness of the *nouvelle* type, and, although Gautier passes it over in silence, suggests the economy of the short-story art at which he himself was trying his hand in 1832.

⁴ *Histoire de l'art dramatique*, I, 254, 299; Lovenjoul, *op. cit.*, No. 830.

Un mot fait éclore un chapitre, et malgré toutes leurs folles brindilles éparpillées à droite et à gauche, ces digressions n'en tiennent pas moins à la tige commune par des filaments et des nervures invisibles. Relevez le feuillage de la main, et vous verrez la branche qui s'attache solidement au tronc; toute action, si elle a réellement une portée philosophique, fait lever une moisson de pensées sous lesquelles il lui arrive quelquefois de disparaître comme la terre aride du sillon sous le manteau d'or des épis.—Lequel vaut mieux de l'épi ou du sillon, de la feuille ou de la branche?¹

No doubt the principle was applied by Gautier himself, although with modifications and a limited *portée philosophique*, and perhaps the remark is the inspiration of Du Camp when he says of Gautier's workmanship: "Le sujet . . . est toujours d'une extrême simplicité, mais l'écrivain a su le parer et l'envelopper, parfois jusqu'à le faire disparaître, d'une forme élégante et touffue."² Similar praise of inherent unity, deserving of quotation in a discussion of Gautier's own procedure, is found in his encomium of Fenimore Cooper:

Les plus beaux romans de Cooper sont composés avec des éléments d'une simplicité extrême. . . . Les personnages n'apparaissent que comme des points blancs et rouges sur le fond d'outre-mer des lointains, ou sur le vert sombre et dur des ébéniers centenaires. Cependant, malgré leur petitesse relative, par leur énergie et leur résolution, ils dominent cette gigantesque nature, et c'est là la source de l'intérêt sublime et profond qui s'attache au *Dernier des Mohicans*, à la *Prairie*. L'orgueil humain est intimement flatté de cette victoire et s'en réjouit par esprit de corps. Cette disposition rendait Fenimore Cooper plus propre que tout autre à réussir dans le roman maritime. . . . L'idée qui éclate à chaque page est celle exprimée par le proverbe breton: "Ma barque est si petite et la mer est si grande!" De là vient tout l'intérêt.³

But these acute bits of criticism stand almost alone. An able practitioner, Gautier, as I have said, was not given to theorizing about fiction.

It is therefore upon the examination of the structure of his stories that conclusions must largely be based. Two types appear to have been evolved, a form exceedingly compact, best represented by *la Morte amoureuse*, and another less restrained but still highly unified,

¹ *Portraits contemporains*, p. 17.

² Du Camp, *op. cit.*, p. 151.

³ *Souvenirs de théâtre, d'art et de critique* (Paris, 1904), pp. 21-22. This is part of a page of criticism of Cooper which occurs in an article on Eugène Sue first published in the *Chronique de Paris* in 1836. It is not listed by Professor Morris, *op. cit.*

of which *Arria Marcella* and *Jettatura* are characteristic examples. The one develops out of the other; the first group is the result of an early tendency culminating in 1836, the second includes some of the best work of the author's maturity.¹

Needless to say, many of his narratives do not yield to this classification. Some are not primarily narrative but descriptive;² some are genuine novels;³ some, within a narrower compass, retain the characteristic structural complexity of the novel.⁴ Even such a tale as *le Chevalier double*, in spite of its strongly emphasized central theme, might be considered a novel *in parvo*, were it not unreasonable to apply modern narrative standards to a story which aims at and achieves the characteristics of an ancient legend.⁵ *La Toison d'or* is an intermediate form. The story is an organic whole; the central theme is the quest of Tiburce, a youth who, having admired womankind only from the point of view of a connoisseur of the fine arts, only in painting and sculpture, determines to seek a flesh-and-blood mistress and, inspired by Rubens, goes to Flanders. At the beginning the interest is fastened upon the question whether Tiburce will find a blond maiden, then it is deflected to the infatuation of Tiburce for Rubens' Magdalene, and ultimately to that development of the character of Gretchen which results in the final solution, with the affections of Tiburce satisfied and his power as an artist revealed. In other words, the attention is not focused. It is not difficult to imagine the expansion of *la Toison d'or* into a full-sized novel, where the character development, no longer compressed into a few lines, would be vastly more convincing; on the other hand, the story could hardly be given a unity comparable to that of *le Roi Candaule* or of *Avatar* without fundamental revision.

¹ In addition to the stories discussed, *la Chaîne d'or* (1837) and especially *la Mille et deuxième nuit* (1842) belong to the second group.

² *Le Pied de momie*, *le Pavillon sur l'eau*, even *Fortunio*, which is a cross-section of a peculiarly sumptuous and voluptuous life with the central figure hardly a man but a personification of a picturesque lavishness.

³ *Le Capitaine Fracasse*, *le Roman de la momie*, etc. The plot of the second is relatively simple. Cf. the simplicity of plot of *la Croix de Berny*, written by Gautier in collaboration with Mme de Girardin, Sandeau, and Méry.

⁴ *Miliona*, *le Berger*, etc. So also *les Roués innocents*, and *Jean et Jeannette*, although in each case the elaborations develop from a single nucleus.

⁵ Other legends and fairy-stories by Gautier approach more closely, in narrative simplicity and concentration of attention, the types under discussion. Cf. the exquisite *Enfant aux souliers de pain* and *Nid de rossignols*, and the mediocre *Oreiller d'une jeune fille*.

But from the whole mass of works of fiction published by Gautier, the brief tales analyzed here, from *la Morte amoureuse* to *Spirite*, emerge as structurally unique.

The credit is probably due to Gautier alone. The likeness of some of the earlier stories to the tales Poe was producing at about the same time in America¹ does not warrant inferences, it has been observed, as to the influence of Poe. Equally fortuitous and no less interesting is the parallel between the later products of Gautier and the nineteenth-century German *Novelle*.

A purely casual remark of the author in *Arria Marcella* that he is presenting "le simple récit d'une aventure bizarre et peu croyable, quoique vraie,"² is nearly identical with Goethe's famous definition: "Was ist eine Novelle anders als eine sich ereignete unerhörte Begebenheit?"³ *Aventure* may be set off against *Begebenheit*, *bizarre et peu croyable* against *unerhörte*, *vraie* against *sich ereignete*, *simple* against *eine*. Indeed, Gautier's statement, put alongside of Goethe's, illuminates the latter, which, "the quintessential result of an investigation . . . conducted intermittently for over thirty years,"⁴ is cast in somewhat oracular form. There is a meager possibility that Gautier was acquainted with this definition. It is a fact that he knew the *Wahlverwandtschaften*,⁵ which includes the story of *Die wunderlichen Nachbarskinder*, the first of Goethe's narratives to be presented to the public under the express title *Novelle*. But there is not the requisite evidence to substantiate a belief that Gautier was inspired by the German, and the remark which so neatly corresponds to Goethe's appears to be a felicitous accident.

¹ It may also be affirmed that there is a resemblance to Hawthorne in some of Gautier's work. In fact, the following criticism of Hawthorne, by Robert Louis Stevenson (*Essay on Hugo*, p. 20), is applicable, in its entirety, to the author of *Jettatura*: "There is a unity, an unwavering creative purpose, about some at least of Hawthorne's romances, that impresses itself on the most indifferent reader; and the very restrictions and weaknesses of the man served perhaps to strengthen the vivid and single impression of his works." Gautier was acquainted with the fiction of Hawthorne (cf. *Portraits contemporains*, p. 157) and had been particularly impressed by the conception of a garden of poisonous flowers in *Rappacini's Daughter*, a story kindred in structure to *Jettatura*, *Avatar*, etc. (cf. *Histoire du Romantisme*, p. 353; *Fusains et eaux-fortes* [Paris, 1907], pp. 308-11).

² *Romans et Contes*, p. 273.

³ *Gespräche mit Eckermann*, January 29, 1827.

⁴ Mitchell, "Goethe's Theory of the Novelle," *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, XXX, 236. This article and Professor Mitchell's thoroughgoing study, *Heyse and his Predecessors in the Theory of the Novelle* (Frankfurt, 1915), are the principal source of the following remarks on the German definitions.

⁵ *Histoire de l'art dramatique*, I, 193; IV, 337.

In practice, the epithet *vraie* is not equivalent to Goethe's *sich ereignete*. For obviously the adventure in *Arria Marcella*, or that in *Avatar*, is not true, could not actually happen, in the same sense as the events of *Der Prokurator* or of *Ferdinand*. Closer to Goethe in this respect are *Jettatura* and *Une Nuit de Cléopâtre*, although these sin against a principle enunciated by one of Goethe's spokesmen: "Ich leugne nicht, dass ich die Geschichten nicht liebe, die unsere Einbildungskraft immer in fremde Länder nötigen. Muss denn alles in Italien und Sizilien, im Orient geschehen? Sind denn Neapel, Palermo und Smyrna die einzigen Orte, wo etwas Interessantes vorgehen kann?"¹ As regards unity and novelty, however, Gautier's stories fully meet the German's requirements. Likewise, Gautier's leisurely expositions find a counterpart in such stories as *Die wunderlichen Nachbarskinder* and *Der Prokurator*, his occasionally appended codas a corresponding feature in *Ferdinand*.

Two other definitions, by Tieck and by Paul Heyse, stand out in the ponderous mass of German criticism, and both of these have their application here. Tieck, writing in 1829, insists with Goethe upon unity and novelty and develops independently the theory that the prime requisite is a single turning-point "von welchem aus sie [die Geschichte] sich unerwartet völlig umkehrt, und doch natürlich, dem Charakter und den Umständen angemessen, die Folge entwickelt. . . ."² Apparently Tieck would give his entire approval to *le Roi Candaule*, where the action turns upon the discovery by the queen that Gyges is inspecting her beauty, and to *Une Nuit de Cléopâtre*, developed about the compact which Cleopatra makes with the young Egyptian. In some of the other Gautier tales, such as *Avatar* and *Spirite*, there is no prominent *Wendepunkt*, but perhaps the theorist would be liberal in his interpretation, for he states that each of the *Novelas exemplares* of Cervantes possesses such a turning-point, yet investigation of these shows, I think, that it is frequently not easy to determine which decisive act shall be so denominated.³

¹Goethe, *Werke*, Weimarer Ausgabe, XVIII, 190, quoted by Mitchell, *Heyse and his Predecessors*, p. 25.

²*Schriften* (Berlin: Reimer, 1829), XI, p. lxxxvi. The theory is discussed by Mitchell, *op. cit.*, pp. 33 ff.

³Closest to the *Novelle* type are *La Gitanilla* and *El Celoso Extremeno*. In the *Coloquio de los Perros* are one or two comments on problems of narration; cf. especially where Cipion urges Berganza to refrain from digressions (p. 340 of the Leipzig, 1869,

More specific and of special application to Gautier is the definition made by Paul Heyse in order to set a standard for his *Deutscher Novellenschatz*:

Im allgemeinen . . . halten wir . . . an der Regel fest der Novelle den Vorzug zu geben, deren Grundmotiv sich am deutlichsten abrundet und . . . etwas Eigenartiges, Spezifisches schon in der blossen Anlage verrät. Eine starke *Silhouette*—um . . . einen Ausdruck der Malersprache zu Hilfe zu nehmen—dürfte dem, was wir im eigentlichen Sinne *Novelle* nennen, nicht fehlen, ja wir glauben, die Probe auf die Trefflichkeit eines novellistischen Motivs werde in den meisten Fällen darin bestehen, ob der Versuch gelingt, den Inhalt in wenige Zeilen zusammenzufassen, in der Weise, wie die alten Italiener ihren Novellen kurze Überschriften gaben, die dem Kundigen schon im Keim den spezifischen Wert des Themas verraten.¹

This is close to Gautier's conception of brief-narrative unity as exemplified in the series of stories under discussion,² the last of which was published five years before the promulgation of Heyse's theory (1871). That is to say, here again are narrative methods parallel and independent.³

Probably Gautier was not the only Frenchman to produce during this period stories comparable in form to the *Novelle*. This structural method would seem sufficiently elastic to lend itself—perhaps with results not so lurid and of deeper literary import—to the purposes of authors in power and doctrine quite different from him.

edition): "Quiero decir que la sigas [la novela] de golpe, sin que la bagas que parezca pulpo, segun la vas añadiendo colas." Gautier refers several times to Cervantes' stories, but not critically (cf. *Voyage en Espagne* [Paris, 1899], pp. 118, 299; *Guide au Louvre*, p. 274).

¹ *Deutscher Novellenschatz* (München, 1871), Einleitung, pp. xix-xx.

² Heyse quotes, for illustration of his theory, Boccaccio's abstract of the ninth *Novella* of the fifth day: "Federigo degli Alberighi ama e non è amato; e in cortesia spendendo si consuma, e rimangli un sol falcone, il quale, non avendo altro, dà a mangiare alla sua donna venutagli a casa: la qual ciò sappiendo, mutata d'animo, il prende per marito e fallo ricco."

Gautier's stories may be summed up quite as succinctly. Cf. the abstracts given in the course of this article. Cf. also the lines of Swinburne which epitomize *Une Nuit de Cléopâtre* (*Poems* [London, 1904], III, 64):

And that great night of love more strange than this,
When she that made the whole world's bale and bliss
Made king of all the world's desire a slave,
And killed him in mid kingdom with a kiss.

³ Speculation about the reasons for these resemblances between Gautier's work and the short-story and the *Novelle* types remains idle until more is known about the French field. Apparently the conditions of modern literature tend to develop two forms of brief tale, as in English where we have not only the close-knit "short-story," but the more loosely woven—and clumsily named—"long short-story."

For Gautier, in any case, one point remains to be made. His critics,¹ maintaining that he is above all a poet and a painter, like to stress either the lyric or the pictorial element in his stories, and grant him small skill in sheer narration. Without doubt their view that fiction was of secondary interest to him is correct. Yet he accepted its conditions more whole-heartedly than they think. There is a suggestion of this truth in his letter to Sainte-Beuve: "*Si j'avais possédé la moindre fortune personnelle, je me serais livré uniquement à l'amour du vert laurier; mais dans la prose où je suis tombé, j'ai toujours défendu les intérêts de l'art. . .*"² And the evidence proves that the structure of many of his tales is far from being either haphazard or spontaneous, that the degree of unity he sometimes attains is the result of deliberate plan, that after all, as a narrator, he is no mean figure.

HORATIO E. SMITH

YALE UNIVERSITY

¹ Faguet, Sainte-Beuve, Lafcadio Hearn, *et al.*

² Lovenjoul, *op. cit.*, Introduction, p. xx.

THE EARLY WRITINGS OF GATIEN DE COURTILZ, SIEUR DE VERGER

I have tried elsewhere to show that the pseudo-*Mémoires* of Courtilz are forerunners of the politico-picaresque novel in France, and that Lesage may have found, at least to some degree, a model among his own countrymen. Courtilz did not begin with *Mémoires*; a study of his earlier works will, I believe, prove that they embody all the essential features of the *Mémoires*, and that they owe little or nothing to foreign influence.

The first pamphlets attributed to him, both published in 1683, are: *La Conduite de la France depuis la paix de Nimègue* and *Réponse au livre intitulé: "La Conduite,"* etc. Such political pamphlets were popular at the time, and the frequently envenomed answers served to increase their success. All we know of Courtilz supports the hypothesis that he was a man to sacrifice sincerity to pecuniary interest. In the *Réponse* there is an obvious effort to advertise the *Conduite*. If Courtilz was cashiered from the army, as some authorities state, a lingering bitterness against his country may have led to the composition of the *Conduite* and some of the other abusive pamphlets. But it is scarcely necessary to seek in such libels for stronger reasons than the desire to turn a penny by spreading scandal. The perpetration of such literature was a dangerous trade—the Archives of the Bastille offer proof—and nobody wished to be implicated in it. Hence the author of the *Réponse* is at no small pains to distinguish himself from the writer of the *Conduite*. After addressing to his antagonist every kind of insult, he makes a criticism which might be extended to all the works of Courtilz. The proverbial thief has caught the thief. "Je tâcherai de [le] réfuter—en faisant toucher au doigt et à l'œil combien il s'abuse dans ses raisonnements, que je dirais qu'il aurait puisés entièrement dans les Gazettes, n'était qu'il y ajoute beaucoup du sien, afin comme je crois, de déguiser le vol qu'il y a fait."

We may pass rapidly over these first pamphlets. The *Conduite* is a violent attack on the French king and his policies. The *Réponse* turns back on the author of the *Conduite* the abuse the latter had

hurled at Louis XIV, refutes a part of his statements, and contradicts the rest. It is a plea in behalf of the French king, using for his defense the very arguments with which he was assailed. France has always desired peace, and if the treaty of Nimègue has remained unfulfilled, the fault lies at the door of those "qui avaient si peu de penchant à la conclure, c.-à-d. l'Espagne et l'Empire."

If Courtilz is really the author of both pamphlets, he has succeeded so well in presenting the case for and against France that C. Rousset believed two authors concerned, one in the pay of Louvois, the other his implacable enemy. This is neither the first nor the last time that the writings of Courtilz have passed as having more historical value than they merit.

In the same year there appeared a little book entitled *Mémoires contenant divers événements remarquables*, etc. The ostensible purpose of the work is to eulogize the existing government of Colbert and Louvois by contrast with the disorder of the last years of Louis XIII and the Fronde. But the greater part of the volume is occupied with the Fronde, because Courtilz takes delight in these scenes of revolt from established authority. The apology of the book, which is destined to become a sort of refrain in Courtilz' prefaces, is of some interest: "Je rapporterai seulement quelques circonstances qui ont été omises, ou par dessein ou pour n'avoir pas été sues de ceux qui en ont écrit, ajoutant pour la satisfaction du lecteur que je ne dirai rien que je ne sache bien, et dont ceux qui étaient de ce temps-là dans les affaires les plus secrètes ne puissent rendre témoignage aussi bien que moi." Here, as always, Courtilz uses this pretext to give free rein to his instinct for scandalous gossip and to pose as a detective in unearthing unsavory secrets in the life of the great. Surely most of the actors in the Fronde were inspired by selfish motives, but Courtilz is in no way of diminishing their pettiness. He is forever in search of some scabrous anecdote, which, he would have us believe, contains the inside history of the cause of significant events.

These first pamphlets show the author joining the ranks of the anonymous scribblers who attacked the policy of the king. They are interesting chiefly as revealing the Frondeur spirit which permeates Courtilz' writings. There is also discernible in germ the

instinct of the political picaro, for this obscure soldier sets himself up as a judge of the action of the great king. We have now to consider another aspect of the same spirit, for Courtilz busied himself also in hawking society scandal. Decency forbids any detailed discussion of the libels attributed to him; they are of interest only as an indication of his taste for this sort of anecdote.

It is well known that the success of Bussy's *Histoire Amoureuse*¹ gave rise to a number of imitations entirely unworthy of the original. Courtilz, always well informed of the taste of the pamphlet-reading public, was naturally led to try his hand at this game also. His efforts bear the mark of hasty composition and lack entirely Bussy's brilliance of style. Addressed to a very different public, they offer only coarseness of anecdote, yet it must be admitted that the aristocratic or ancillary adventures attributed to king and courtiers are related with much vivacity by a master of the *esprit gaulois* in its ruder form. The same talent for rapid narration and burlesque scene figures conspicuously in the *Mémoires*. Such satire directed by a commoner against the high and mighty of the realm is the theme of the *Annales de la cour et de Paris* (1701). The latter work drew from Bayle the following significant comment:

Toutes ces pièces [he has just named *Les Annales* and a number of other works attributed to Courtilz] sont de la façon de l'auteur des *Mémoires du Comte de Rochefort*—même genre, même style et même hardiesse de médire de tout le monde, et de s'y débiter pour un personnage qui a eu part aux intrigues, et qui sait *quid rex reginae dixerat, et quid Juno fabulata est cum Jove*. Cependant c'est un petit particulier sans bien, sans fortune, et qui apparemment n'écrit tout cela que pour le vendre aux libraires de Hollande. Il faut pourtant qu'il ait quelque habitude avec les fainéants de Paris qui lui apprennent tout ce qui s'y conte de vrai ou de faux entre les nouvellistes,

Doubtless morality in high places left much to be desired, but all these libels are characterized by a desire to blacken the court for the amusement of the vulgar herd. Their aim is to show in a grotesque manner that the great king, for all his glory and military prowess, is subject to the same low passions as the least of his pages and the humblest of comedians.

¹ Of course similar libels had been published before Bussy's work. For a characteristic example see Janmart de Broullant, *Histoire de Pierre de Marteau* (Paris, 1888).

Les Nouveaux Intérêts des Princes de l'Europe, published in 1685, formulates a political doctrine which is found in all the writings of Courtilz. The journalistic nature of this book soon obliged the author to revise it; enlarged editions appeared in 1686 and 1688. The work claims our interest by its matter and by its method.

Lenglet Dufresnoy, who detested Courtilz as a fabricator of falsehood that passed for history, pronounces a criticism which is too severe to be just. He denounces our author as a bungling plagiarist of the Duc de Rohan, whose tiny book, *De l'Intérêt des Princes et Etats de la Chrétienté*, appeared in 1639. As in fact Courtilz' work is a perpetual application of Rohan's treatise to actual problems, a rapid survey of the latter may be in order. The first part is a summary discussion of the maxims which a state should follow; the second, a chronicle intended as an illustration. The maxims offer nothing particularly original. Almost all can be found in the political writings of Machiavelli. Rohan begins by naming two powers, France and Spain, which maintain the European equilibrium. The other nations should join now one now the other to prevent either from becoming too powerful. He then sets forth maxims for the use of the different countries in the aggrandizement of their dominion. The maxims for Spain are characteristic and may be briefly summarized:

First, the nations must rid themselves of the idea that religion is anything but a mantle in politics. For example, the king of Spain should profit by the religious wars in France, England, and the Empire. Secondly, each nation must maintain a system of secret negotiations (*intelligences*) in foreign lands—

ce qu'il faut faire par la voie des ambassadeurs, . . . par les moines et prédicateurs, . . . par l'argent. Surtout il faut s'attacher à gagner les principaux ministres—ou rendre odieux ceux qu'on trouvera trop fidèles, et en toute manière les perdre. Le troisième point touche les négociations et traités, auxquels il faut employer des personnes secrètes et patientes, montrer toujours un désir de paix pour endormir les autres, et cependant se préparer à la guerre pour les surprendre au dépourvu. S'il arrive dispute entre deux petits princes, il faut s'entremettre de leur accommodement, ou comme juge ou comme arbitre, et en l'une et l'autre qualité avoir, s'il se peut, en dépôt ce qui est en débat entre eux, les aigrir—au lieu de les adoucir, s'accommoder avec l'un pour partager les dépouilles de l'autre et sur le

partage déposséder tous les deux. Ne perdre aucune occasion de s'entre-mettre des affaires de ses voisins, mais exclure les autres des siennes. Le quatrième point consiste à être toujours puissamment armé; c'est un moyen assuré pour tenir en devoir ses sujets, et en respect ses voisins: pour les surprendre s'ils s'endorment et pour se prévaloir des occasions inopinées. Le cinquième point est la réputation.

Rohan gives briefly general maxims: Courtilz, while keeping the maxims, develops and particularizes the thought; he studies it in its relation to contemporary events. Hence he is not always at one with his model. For instance, in speaking of the interests of the Holy See, Rohan states that the pope should rely on the power of excommunication to maintain his influence. This counsel, which is opposed to the spirit of the work toward religion, is repudiated by Courtilz, who treats the papacy as any other power and recommends the same policy to all. His style is incisive: "il ne faut plus que les papes prétendent élever leur pouvoir en se servant du prétexte de la religion, qui est une ruse maintenant trop connue pour avoir un bon effet. Les mesures qu'ils ont à prendre doivent être et plus ingénieuses et plus délicates."

Courtilz proposed Louis XIV as his model and held him up to other princes as an example. This is not a retraction of what he had written in his first pamphlets; means had become indifferent to him, and he judges the king of France the ideal monarch because he had best attained his aim—the aggrandizement of his personnel power. Hence the author has unstinted praise for what, two years before, had apparently so scandalized him. His admiration for the policy of the great king persists in the *Mémoires*, and although he attacks sharply ministers and nobles, he has nothing but praise for the royal ordinances.

Moreover, Courtilz is under no illusion as to the bearing of the *Nouveaux Intérêts*; like Machiavelli, he disavows all moral responsibility:

Nous savons bien que quelque adresse qu'emploie un prince, cela ne l'autorise pas à faire une injustice, supposé que ce qu'il entreprit fût injuste; le fond d'une affaire ne change point, quoiqu'on y donne une autre face; mais ce n'est pas de cela que nous traitons ici; notre unique dessein est de faire voir comment il faut qu'un empereur s'y prenne pour prendre plus d'autorité qu'il n'en a dans l'empire. Si cela est juste ou non, si cela est

conforme ou contraire aux lois du pays; c'est ce que nous ne prétendons pas de décider: pourvu que nous donnions une idée qui réponde à notre sujet, nous ne nous mettons pas en peine du reste.

Many a Machiavellian trait could be cited;¹ the author supports his theories by examples from contemporary history, and doubtless would have answered critics in the words of the great Florentine, saying that he did but put at the service of princes what their politics had taught him. In a similar way he might have defended the exposition of social sores in his pamphlets and *Mémoires* by saying with the moralist that he returned to society only what he learned from it.

I have said that the *Nouveaux Intérêts* are, from a double point of view, characteristic of the spirit of the writings of Courtilz. First, they offer a precious index to the psychology of his heroes, for there is found constantly in his *Mémoires* indulgence for the theory which subordinates everything to the interest of state or king. Secondly, the book marks the author's inclination to criticize the actions of princes; he is in accord with the mot of Machiavelli which the picares appropriated to their own use: "A conoscer bene quella [la natura] de' principi bisogna esser popolare." We may notice also the tendency which persists in all Courtilz' works to busy himself with universal politics. Many pages of his *Mémoires* might find a fitting place in the *Nouveaux Intérêts*.

Moreover, the book permits us to understand the method of Courtilz by the contrast it offers with the work of Rohan. The latter prescribes general maxims, good for all epochs, in Machiavelli's manner. Courtilz' borrowings prove that the principles were not, as he pretends, superannuated. Rohan considers politics *sub specie aeternitatis*, while our author studies events from day to day, trying to seize the significance of each change and to make his conclusions conform to the actual phase. He had his eyes on the men and problems of the moment and sought to paint them to the life. He uses everywhere the same method. His *Mémoires* often begin in the first quarter of the seventeenth century, for he liked to portray the scenes of the ministry of Richelieu and of the Fronde, but

¹ It may be worth mention that a translation of the *Prince* by Amelot de la Housaye appeared in 1683. A second edition appeared in 1684, and a third in 1686. The political writings of Machiavelli had been translated several times before.

the narrative closes near the time of its composition. "Il serait à désirer que ceux qui se mêlent d'écrire nous donnassent l'histoire de nos jours," he says in one of his prefaces. For his part he transformed this history into novels, but into novels which passed for history. To deceive his contemporaries thus he must perforce have an eye on actuality. There is the secret of his realism.

We have seen that the first works of Courtilz are frankly cynical and satiric. But if he poses as scandalized by the conduct of the great and the intrigues of the court, he had studied everything with a minute attention and took pleasure in painting in detail the intimate lives of the world's masters whose pretensions exposed them to his ridicule. The heroes of the *Mémoires* adopt the same methods he had used himself in his early works.

More interesting than any of these are the biographies of the Vicomte de Turenne and of the Amiral de Coligny; the one immediately preceded, the other followed, the author's first attempt at memoirs. Both contain prefaces which merit passing attention. As a foreword to the *Vie de Turenne* the "editor" states that he is publishing a manuscript found among the papers of the late Captain Du Buisson, who in turn claims to be the first biographer of Turenne. For fear of giving offense to living persons, he declares his intention "de retenir son œuvre au fond d'un coffre jusqu'à ce qu'on l'en retire après sa mort si on la juge digne d'être mise en lumière." Du Buisson nowhere declares himself in the intimacy of Turenne and does not pretend to special sources of information. He nowhere names himself in his book, which is written in the third person. As proof of his competency in military affairs he states that he has been a soldier all his life. Courtilz' object seems to have been to secure for his work the interest of a first biography.

In the *Vie de Coligny* (1686) is found for the first time an artifice which becomes familiar in his subsequent works. The author declares himself sprung from a house allied to that of Coligny and claims to possess documents hitherto unused. The advantage gained by such a pretension is evident. The reading public, at a time when critical methods were in their infancy, would be slow to contradict a man so well equipped. Having once invented this artifice, Courtilz had no intention of abandoning it. So hereafter

when we read of the secret policies and actions of ministers in memoirs of which the supposed authors claim to relate only what has passed before their eyes, we are to remember that the heroes have served the government for years in secret missions.

The biographies read like novels and they have many traits in common with the *Mémoires* which followed. To mention but one: a duel (the best known being that of D'Artagnan) figures conspicuously at the beginning of the career of almost all Courtilz' heroes. The same device appears in both biographies; Turenne's nascent belligerency is, to be sure, quashed by his mother, but the youthful Coligny kills his adversary.

As an old soldier Courtilz could appreciate military qualities, and he took pleasure in portraying Coligny and Turenne as perfect captains and as gentlemen without reproach. There is an instinct for hero-worship even in the picares. So, although here as everywhere, he cannot resist the temptation to write the entire history of the epoch, he reveals the intimate character of these men by constant anecdote, at the same time showing their rôle in great political events. He insists on the good discipline they maintained by their personal interest in the troops, on the simplicity of their manners, on their loyalty to their superiors and their kindness toward their dependents. He is never tired of contrasting their blunt honesty and sincerity with the duplicity of politicians. It may be noted that the queen regent as portrayed in the *Vie de Coligny* offers a striking parallel with the Mazarin of the *Mémoires*.

Here, as always, Courtilz bases his claim to the reader's interest on the unpublished details he offers. A single one, admired by Bayle, may be cited for the light it throws on the necessity of caution in the reception of such anecdotes in his work. By way of illustrating the temperance of Turenne, the author relates his generous protection of a girl to whom a soldier was about to offer violence after the capture of a city. A similar incident is found in the revised edition of the biography where a fair captive is brought to Turenne as his share of the booty. A like story is told of Coligny. When we realize that the Sieur de Pontis tells in his *Mémoires*, which Courtilz certainly knew, how he had saved the honor of a girl at the capture of Negrepelice, that Pontis may well have appropriated the anecdote

from the *Gestes ensemble la Vie du Preulx Chevalier Bayard*, our skepticism grows apace and we wonder whether Alexander's courtesy to Timoclea is not father to all the rest.

Indeed, there are many incidents which recall Plutarch, and Courtilz is constantly comparing Coligny and Turenne to Alexander. At all events, we must admit that Courtilz appropriated something of Plutarch's idea of biography. At the beginning of the life of Nicias, Plutarch says: "Au demeurant je me suis étudié de recueillir des choses qui ne sont pas communes à tout le monde, que d'autres ont par-ci par-là écrites ou que j'ai retirées de quelques antiquailles ou de quelques anciens registres, dont j'ai tissé une narration qui ne sera point, ce me semble, inutile, ains servira beaucoup à connaître les mœurs et la nature du personnage." Courtilz also liked to cite personal traits and apothegms of his heroes. Thus we learn of Turenne's hatred of tobacco and intoxication, and of the means he took to cure his officers of the second vice. Again, we hear Coligny expressing the stoic indifference of the warrior toward death or his scorn for soldiers who trick themselves out like court ladies. The words are always accompanied by an anecdote showing the hero in action, for it is thus that Courtilz paints men.

The picaresque as well as the heroic genre has its roots in this method of drawing character. Anecdotes and jests may well become, in the hands of the picaros, a sharp weapon of satire. It is only necessary to choose other incidents or tell them with a different twist to bring out the ridiculous side and mark the points of contact common to great and humble. Courtilz had done this in the satiric pamphlets; he was to do it again in the *Mémoires*.

What has been said of these first writings of Courtilz may suffice to indicate the main lines of the work. I have tried to trace its evolution and indicate its origins: these owed little or nothing to foreign sources. He drew his matter from reality: from the manners of men who lived around him, from recent or contemporary history, even from newspapers, as a realist of our day. He himself avows it. An old soldier, always endowed with a keen faculty of observation, he had garnered a rich harvest of military anecdotes. His childhood was passed under the Fronde, a time when traditional dignity was greatly weakened, and the spirit of those tumultuous years was

imprinted in him. • Hence he loves to return to those scenes and show princes and nobles in revolt against their sovereign. On the one occasion when he treated an epoch far removed from his own, he chose a rebel for the subject of his eulogy. We have seen that his political philosophy is most cynical; his conception of life was the same. There are no good women in his pages, and his men are first cousins to the picaros. We could not expect pastoral or idyllic novels from such a man; he will be necessarily a realist and his realism will bear on the lower aspects of human nature. He sees only a struggle of all against all; each for himself is the universal motto. *Garde-toi d'être dupe* and *rie qui pourra* will be his philosophy of life.

BENJAMIN M. WOODBRIDGE

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

LOCUS IN GALLO-ROMAN

In the west, Latin *cocta* became **kôχta* < **kôξta*,¹ and likewise *coxa* developed through **kôχsa* to **kôξsa*.² French has *p* in *cep* < *cippu*, beside *f* < *v* < *b* < *p* in *chef*, with a loss of final *o* later than the change of *p* to *v* between vowels.³ It is therefore probable that *locus* and *locōs* developed through **lôgos* to *lôks* in Provençal, which shared with French the general voicing of intervocalic occlusives. The form *lôks* was contemporary with **kôχsa* in southern France. After *coxa* had changed to **kôχsa*, no simple Provençal word contained the sound-group *ks*, aside from *lôks* and other such forms with inflectional *s*. The new *ks* of *lôks* was partially protected by the *k* of *lôk*, but nevertheless it was widely changed to *χs*. This repetition of the development *χs* < *ks*, apparently several centuries later than the formation of medial *χs*, has parallels in French *frêne* < *fraisne* beside Latin *pōno* < **posno*, and Spanish *estao* < *estado* beside older *veis* < *veedes* < *uidētis*.

In the Hispanic languages, open vowels were commonly changed to closer sounds by contact with following palatals, and also under the influence of vowel-harmony.⁴ These two general principles governed the alteration of *ê* and *ô* in Provençal likewise, but here the closure was fractural, not total as in Hispanic. Thus *ie* was developed in the derivatives of *lectu* > **lêχto* > **lêξt*, *melius* > **mêλλos*, *peior* (usually spelled *peior* and often wrongly supposed to have long *e*),⁵ because of palatal-contact; and in the derivatives of *heri*, *meu*, *seruio*, because of harmonic change, after stressless *i* and *u* had become close in contact with other vowels. A diphthong written *uo* or *ue* was developed in the derivatives of *cocta* > **kôξta*, **posseo* > **pôššo* (afterward replaced by *poss' ego* > **pôsko*, with *uo*

¹ *Modern Language Review*, VIII, 492.

² I use the following special symbols: *χ* = German *ch* in *acht*; *γ* = Dutch *g* in *dagen*; *ξ* = German *ch* in *acht*; *λ* = Portuguese *lh*; *u* and *ô* as in German. A grave accent marks stressed vowels that are open, an acute those that are close.

³ Final *ô* would have become *p*, in accord with *vent* < *uēndo*.

⁴ *Modern Philology*, XI, 347.

⁵ Stolz-Schmalz, *Lat. Grammatik*, München, 1910, p. 50.

borrowed from **puois*), **vòλλο*, because of palatal-contact; and in the derivatives of **bòvi* (nom. pl.), *moueo* < **mòvio*, **òffrio*, because of harmonic change.

If evidence of early vowel-breaking is shown in the modern border-form *niau* for ordinary Provençal *nòu* < *noue*, we can admit the influence of French (**nūov* > **niðu* > *niau*), as in Mistral's *chin* for *can*; or perhaps *noue* sometimes became **nòvi* instead of **nòv* before a vowel, and thus acquired a diphthong by harmonic change. The reduction of *noue* and **nòvo* to *nòu* was too late to produce a development like that of *meu* > *mieu*. Beside pre-literary Provençal **nòvi* < *nouī*, there were forms with endings that would not produce harmonic change: *nòva*, *nòvas*, **nòvo*, **nòvos*. The majority favored the simple vowel, and this is why we generally find *nòu* (or *nau* < *nòu*) as the modern form of the adjective. The variant *niau* (< *nūou*) seems to imply analogic alteration of **nòvo* or *nòu*, due to **nuovi* (< **nòvi*) or its derivative. In the same way *suegre*, an early variant of *sogre* < *soc(e)ru*, can be explained as corresponding to Latin *soc(e)rī* or *socrūs*. There is no good ground for thinking that any occlusive caused *ò* to become a diphthong in early Provençal. Even the palatal affricate that was developed from *k*, in a form between **kòket* and *cotz*, did not have the fractural power shown by *λ* in **fòλλα* < *fuolha*.

Provençal **lòxs* developed through **lòxs* to **luois*, in accordance with the derivatives of **kòχta* and **kòχsa*. The *uo* of **luois* was often extended by analogy to the derivative of *locu*, so that we find forms written *luoc* and *luec* beside normal *loc* in early Provençal. And conversely the *i* of **luois* was replaced by analogic *k*. These stem-changes have numerous parallels in Romanic speech-history. Mistral's dialect uses as a singular the historic plural *bìðu* < *būðu* < **buovi* < **bòvi*, beside *nòu* < *noue*, *nòu* < **nòvo*, whereas Catalan *bòu* < *boue* corresponds to *nòu* < *noue*, *nòu* < **nòvo*. A more remarkable change is seen in Genoese *fonzo*, with the sound *z* that belongs to its plural *fonzi* < *fungī*. If Tuscan *fungo* is not bookish, beside *tronco* < *truncu*, its *u* was borrowed from the derivative of *fungī*, which would have developed *ú* from *ù* because of early palatal-contact. So too Portuguese *fungo* may owe its *u* to a lost derivative of *fungī*. Spanish has *nudo*, against Portuguese *noo* < *nòdu*, with analogic *u*

taken from the derivative of *nōdī*. A complex development is found in Spanish *usco* beside *vosco*: the latter represents *uōs* with the suffix of *uōbīscu*, while the former apparently contains **vus* < **vuves* < *uōbīs*, combined with the same suffix.

Spoken Walloon has *nu* < *nūdu* and *nūf* < *noue*: *ūo* contracted to *ū*, just as *te* did to *ī* in *kwīr* < **kwīter* < *quaero*.¹ Where Latin *ū* became *ū*, the treatment of *uo* depended on the relative dates of *ū* > *ū* and *ō* > *uo*. In southern France, outside of the Gascon region, the formation of *uo* was generally so early that it became *ūo* or *ūe*, corresponding to *ū* < *ū*. As *ūo* was dissimilated to *ūe* in Castilian, we might assume *ūo* > *ūe* > *ūe* for some of the Provençal dialects; modern *ūe* is found in southern Provence. But Provençal speech has the sound *e* in *autre* < *alteru*, *katre* < **kwattro*, *mèrle* < *merulu*, so that *ūo* > *ūe* could have been a normal development when the stress was on *ū*. Mistral's *iō* is presumably derived from an older *ūe* through *ūō*: the sound *e* is kept in *pièi* (< *pūeis*) because of the following *i*.²

In southern Languedoc, *ūo* has become *iō*, parallel with *sūau* > *siau*. Thus the derivatives of *folia*, *hodie*, *locu*, *longe*, *nocte*, and *oculu* are written *fiolha*, *ioi*, *lioc*, *lion*, *nioch*, *iol*, in Langlade's *Poésies languedociennes* (Montpellier, 1906). For this region analogic *lioga*, beside normal *loga* < *loca*, needs no special explanation. Where *ūo* regularly made *ūō* or *ūe*, the form *lōk* caused *liōk* and *lioga* to regain their *o*-sound. Thus Mistral's dialect has *ō* in *liō* and *liogo*, beside *ō* in the derivative of *folia* (borrowed from French?) and *iō* generally elsewhere.

In Switzerland and the neighboring portions of France, where consonants are treated mainly as in the north, some of the modern dialects have *fwa* meaning 'fire,' and this form occurs in the same dialect as *lwa* 'place,' *kwé* < *coriu*, *kwèt* < *coctu*.³ Free *ō*, for example that of *boue*, has not usually produced a diphthong in the *fwa*-region, so we may assume *lwa* < **lōis* < *lōxs* < **lōγos* < **lōgos*. The difference between *lwa* and *kwé* implies **lwé* beside **kwér*: an early final *wé* became *wa*.

¹ In ordinary spelling these words are *nou*, *noûf*, *quér*.

² Mistral writes *ue* for his *ō* and also for the *ūe* of southern Provence; and *quatre* for *katre* beside *caire* for *kaire* < *quadru*.

³ *Revue des patois gallo-romans*, I, 178-79.

In northern France we find *grieu* < **griewo* < **grieŋo* < *græcu* beside *rover* < **rowar* < **royar* < *rogāre*: final *o* was lost before *w* changed to *v*. *Vrai* seems to be a derivative of *uēr' aio*; ¹ *ami* could have come from **amiū* < **amiu* < **amiwo*, with assimilation as in *aïe* < *adiūtāt*, *fiz* < **fiuts* < **filts*. We may therefore assume that *locu(s)* made French **luou(s)*, parallel with *græcu* > *grieu* and *cor* > **kuor*. The derivative of free *ō* is commonly spelled *oe* or *ue* in early French. Where *oe* is written, we can assume that the scribe's pronunciation was *ue* or *uō*, probably with the stress on the second vowel. But the *i* of *lieu* indicates *üe* or *üō* as the diphthongal derivative of *ō*. Gascon has *oelh* (*wēλ*) corresponding to the Languedoc form *iol* < *uolh* (*üol*), and similar variations existed in the north. The French sound *ü* is kept in *cuit* < **küeit* < *coctu*: from *lit* < **lieit* < **lieġt* < **lëġt* < *lectu* we know that free *ē* gave the same result as *e* before a palatal in French, and it seems clear that this principle applies to the derivatives of *ō* also.

In § 75 of his French grammar (Heidelberg, 1908), Meyer-Lübke says that *ueu* became *eu* after a labial or velar sound, and was changed to *ieu* by dissimilation otherwise. This theory of *lieu* is hardly reasonable. In Portuguese *luta* < *lūta* < *lucta* and Rumanian *închide* = Italian *inchiude*, we find assimilative interchanges of *i* and *u*. But are there any examples of dissimilative *i* < *u* or *u* < *i* in Romanic speech-history? We have no right to assume dissimilation in Portuguese *coisa* for *cousa* < *causa*: here the development of *oi* was analogic, arising from a normal interchange in assimilative formations like *couro* < *coiro* < *coriu*, *noute* < *noite* < *nocte*.

The sounds *i* and *u* are as widely separated as either is from *a*. A change of *e* to *a* or *i* is natural enough; but can we admit the possibility of **irare* < *arāre*, **vida* < *uīdī*, as dissimilative developments? This possibility is implied by Meyer-Lübke's theory of *lieu*. Meyer-Lübke seems to confuse *ueu* with *üeu*: he says that the theory of *ieu* < *ueu* was originated by Foerster (*Aiol*, p. lii). If we look into the matter, we find that Foerster assumes *üe* < *ō* and *iëu* < *üeu*; also that Meyer-Lübke (§ 55) is acquainted with the *üe* assumed elsewhere by Foerster. It may be well to add that the words *cointe* and *loin* cannot properly be brought into the discussion.

¹ *Romania*, XXXV, 121.

The French derivatives of *cognitu* and *longe* acquired close *o*, by reason of nasal-influence, before the *o* of **ῥόλλα* changed to *uo*.

We may assume that *o* made *uo* > *ue* > *üe* or *o* > *uo* > *üo* > *üe* in French; a weakening of stress reduced *ue* or *üe* to *e* in *avec*. Perhaps there was a diphthong *üō* earlier than *üe*, but this would not have affected the later distinction between *ō* < *üō* < *üe* and *iō* < *ieu* < *üeu*. Early French had *i* for *iei* and *üi* for *üei*. In the same way the middle sound of *üeu* tended to disappear. The first change was *üeu* > *üōu*, with labial assimilation. The next step would have normally been *üōu* > *äu*, parallel with *üei* > *üi*. It is probable that **liu* (written *liu*?) was developed, and changed to *li* in accord with *üi* > *ü* in the derivative of *lucta*. But there was also a widespread reaction against use of *üōu*.

The development of *üōu* was earlier than the change of *üe* to *üō* otherwise, so that **kuor* > *küer* and **luou* > **lüeu* > **liōu* came to have different stressed vowels, the stress having been displaced as in Provençal *úo* > *uè* and Spanish *úo* > *ué*. Children who said **liōu* were corrected by their elders, and stressed *e* was restored. But *e* could not be maintained between labial vowels. As grown persons insisted on the sound *e*, children kept it by saying *lieu*. Here the *e* was between unlike vowels, and was safe for a while. The stressed vowels of *küer* and *lieu* remained the same; so did those of later *küör* and *liōü*. The form written *liu* may have been *liü* < *liōü*, or *liü* < **liüü*.

If *aluec* was not borrowed from the Provençal derivative of *ad* (*illu*)*locu*, it may have come from *ad ill' hoc*. The variant *luec* is based on *aluec*; and we can explain *iluec* in the same way, or refer it to *ex ill' hoc*, with the accusative *hōc* (< *hocc*) instead of the ablative *hōc*.

French *ueil* (*üe*λ) and *ieus* differ in the same way as *cuer* and *lieu*. The cause of the difference was evidently the sound *u*. We have no right to assume a formation of *ieus* from *els*, as Matzke does in the *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, XX, 10. Such a development, aside from the difficulty about the date of *ie* < *e*, would hardly be possible without a general change of *ō* to *e*. As French keeps the sound *ō* in *œil*, *cœur*, and countless other words, it is unreasonable to assume that *oculōs* became *els*, except in dialects (if there were any such) that regularly changed *ō* to *e*. It is plain that the

written *e* of *els* might be an approximate spelling of the sound *ō*, comparable to mediaeval German *ou* and *eu* for the diphthong *ōū* (which has become *ai* or *oi* in modern speech, though still written *eu*). If a scribe was accustomed to writing *ue* for *ūō*, and *eu* for *ōu* or *ōū*, in a dialect that had no *ō* outside of these diphthongs, he would naturally write *e* where he heard the simple *ō* of another dialect.

French *ūel* developed to *ōl*, parallel with *kūer* > *kōr*; *ūels* made **ūeus* > *ieus* > *iōs*, in accord with *lieu* > *liō*.

EDWIN H. TUTTLE

NORTH HAVEN, CONN.

[As in all his work in historical linguistics, Mr. Tuttle approaches the vexed *locus* question by way of a closer analysis of the physiological factors at work. In his hands this method, which seeks a more penetrating observation of the phonetic changes involved, has produced results often extremely suggestive, notably in the field of Vulgar Latin. It may be seriously questioned, however, whether in the foregoing article he has not made too little use of historical data, and also whether he has not paid too little attention to differences of dialect.

One might also reproach Mr. Tuttle for not giving due weight and attention to those who have preceded him in his arduous quest: one would hardly gather from the preceding exposition that previous attempts to "settle the *locus* business" have been many and persistent. Ascoli, Foerster, Schwan, Gröber, Meyer-Lübke, Neumann, C. Joret, G. Paris, Suchier, Matzke, Mussafia, Voretzsch, Geijer, P. Marchot, A. Thomas, and others, have all dealt with the matter in more or less detail. The list is rather formidable.¹ "Cette question est une des plus ardues de la phonétique française," wrote G. Paris, and, unless all experience is at fault, it will be ultimately solved, as other vexed problems have been solved, by the patient collaboration of many minds, each contributing new facts, or new combinations of facts, until finally a solution is reached which is so simple and convincing that it commends itself to all. In offering the following supplement to Mr. Tuttle's article I shall be presenting, in the main, what seem to me results already achieved, as to the north French forms, in the many discussions preceding Mr. Tuttle's. I shall also seize the opportunity to

¹ For a summary of the discussion up to 1897, see Lindström, *L'Analogie dans la Déclinaison des Substantifs latins de la Gaule*, pp. 167-76, where, however, Matzke's suggestive article, *Mod. Lang. Notes*, VII, 65-69, is overlooked. Since 1897 the most important contributions which have come to my attention are: Meyer-Lübke, *Zeit. f. Frz. Spr. u. Litt.*, XXXII (1908), 295; Gröber, in the *Studi letterari* dedicated to Pio Rajna (1911), p. 407; A. Thomas, *Romania*, XXIX, 585, n.

incorporate suggestions of my own, some of which I made as long ago as 1894, in a paper read before the Modern Language Association (see the *Whitney Memorial Volume*, p. 117), but never published.

The north French problem is triple: How is the apparently irregular retention of the post-tonic (*u*) in *lieu*, *feu*, *queu* to be explained? What is the relation of these forms to the adverbs *iluec*, *lués*, and to the forms *luec*, *fuec*, *cuec*, which occur, particularly in the S. W. dialects? How is the (*i*) of *lieu* (cf. *feu*, *jeu*, *queu*) to be accounted for?

Those who attack the problem of the *-ocus* group are led, if not compelled, to deal more or less with five other related groups: (a) OF *pou-peu*, *poi paucum*; *bou* 'arm-ring' G. *balg*, *baug-*; *trou* **traugus*; (b) *fou*, *fay* *fagus*; *esclou* G. *slag-*; *sarcou*, *sarquieu* **sarquagus* for *sarcophagus*;¹ (c) *clou* *clavus*; *Angieus* *Andegavis*; *Peitieu* *Pictavis*; (d) OF *lou*, *leu* *lūpus*; (e) OF *jou*, western *ju jūgum*, and probably OF *cous*, western *cus* **cūgus* for *cūcus* 'cuckoo'.² But these groups I must leave aside for the present with the remark that I hope some light will be thrown upon them by the treatment of the *-ocus* group below. Their explanation is certainly to be sought in that ever-enlarging chapter which deals with the disturbing influences of the *-s* of flexion, and in an as yet incomplete chapter of OF grammar which will deal with the solution into (*u*) of labial or labialized consonants.

As to the *lōcus* group, having in mind the close companionship of VL (ē) and (ø), we shall be on sure ground if we study the *-ocus* words side by side with *caecus* OF *cieus*, and with VL *sēquis*, *sēquit* OF *sieus*, *sieut*. To do this was one of Suchier's notable contributions: he was also right in insisting upon the early appearance of (*ieu*) in *lieu*. His inclusion of *lieu* and *gieu* under the rubric (*ieu*) instead of under (*ueu*) was natural and proper for an OF grammar which covers a period beginning with the year 1100.

When, therefore, we confront It. *luogo*, *cuore*, OSp. *luego*, *cuer*, with OF *cuer*, there really is no good reason to doubt the regular lengthening, in North France,³ of either (ø) in *lōcus* or of (ē) in *caecus*, late VL *lōgus*,

¹ In view of the V(ulgar) L(atin) aversion to intervocalic (*f*), **sarquagus* and not **sarcōfus* (Meyer-Lübke, *Zeit. f. rom. Phil.*, IX, 538) seems to me the correct starting-point for Fr. *cercueil*. For the unification of the group *co-a* to *qua*, *ca* one might compare Prov. *encar inchoare* (Herzog, *Zeit. f. Frz. Spr.*, XXXIV, 305); also Fr. *caillier*, It. *quagliare* from VL *quagulare* for *coagulare* (*ibid.*, XLI, 143). There is no need for so desperate a suggestion as Constans' **sarcōlium* (*Roman de Troie*, VI, 122).

² The OF forms of this word which show a (*p*), such as *coup* (oblique case) and the derived *coupaud*, are, I believe, to be explained by an association with a fem. *coupe culpa* = *cunnus*; see E. W. Fay, *Classical Quarterly*, I, 13-15; also *Mod. Phil.*, X, 441.

³ Provençal, because it was different speech-unity, is an entirely different matter, and there may be some question as to the S. W. dialects (Poitou). Mr. Tuttle, I fear, will cause confusion by associating this lengthening with that in *dōctus*, *lēctus*: it is not clear to the reader that the two phenomena belong to different dates. See G. Paris' review of Voretzsch, *Romania*, XXIX, 585. Besides, it is anything but certain that Fr. *lit* went through the stage **lieit*.

kēgus, coinciding in all respects with the acc. pl. *lōgos*, *kēgos*.¹ With these may be associated ps. 2 and ps. 3 of *sēquēre*, later *sēguis*, *sēguil*. If now the groups *-gus*, *-gul* are resolved to *-us*, *-ut*, we shall have, strictly speaking, no infraction of the law of the finals—a matter of some importance from the point of view of theory. This is essentially the solution offered by G. Paris,² and it is unnecessary to use space to justify the passage of (*gu*) or even of (*g*) to (*u*); instances of this change are familiar enough.³ What has not hitherto been put to the test of discussion is the idea that for the groups under consideration the resolution of (*gu*) to (*u*) is conditioned upon a following dental (*s*) (*t*) (*l*),⁴ and hence took place only in the two inflected cases of the nouns and in the second and third sg. Ps. of *sēquēre*. One might select as typical the participial substantive **sēquīta* OF *sieute*,⁵ which does not share the development as to *-kt-* of *exlēcta* OF *eslīte* on the one hand, nor as to *-t-* that of *laeta* VL *lēta* OF *liee* on the other; that is, in *sēquis* later *sēguis* there was both lengthening of the tonic vowel and resolution of (*gu*) to (*u*); similarly in *kēgus* and *lōgus*.

From ancient *lōgus* we should expect to pass first to **luqus* and then to **lueus*, but the latter form, as Suchier rightly insisted (notwithstanding the authority of G. Paris, who printed a supposedly archaic *lueu* in his last revision of the *St. Alexis*), is nowhere attested: the oldest central Fr. examples show *lieus*.⁶ How explain this? If we pronounce *lueus*, with

¹ There is plenty of evidence of the voicing of *-c-* to *-g-*; cf. e.g., *Drogus* for *Drōcus* of the year 697 (*Romania*, XXXI, 235); also the inverse *prolocus* for *prologus* in a continuator of Fredegarius (*Roman. Forsch.*, X, 864).

² *Romania*, XIV, 158: "chute ou vocalisation très ancienne de la consonne précédant l'u, ce qui produit une diphtongue composée de la tonique et de l'u." Paris thus remained uncertain as to whether or not *-g-* "fell," and, like Schwan-Behrens and most others, he did not confine this "chute ou vocalisation" to the inflected forms. The latter idea seems at one time to have occurred to Meyer-Lübke, for he asked (*Zeit. f. rom. Phil.*, XI, 541): "Sind few u. s. w. die alten Nominativformen?" To justify the answer "yes" to this question was the purpose of my Philadelphia paper, 1894. Provençal, to judge from *sec*, *siec*, *sēquīt*, knows nothing of this "vocalisation."

³ A somewhat miscellaneous collection of material was made by Ulbrich, *Zeit. f. rom. Phil.*, II, 536. The matter is treated with more acumen by Meyer-Lübke, *ibid.*, XI, 541.

⁴ Possibly also (*r*): *sieure* *sēquēre*, *QLR*, 387, would then be "regular." The small group *eue aqua*, *ive ēqua*, *sive sēquam*, where the sonorous *-a* seems to take the place of the dental, deserves a separate study; for this the materials are ready at hand in the two dissertations, Brand, 1887; *Studien zur Geschichte von inlautendem qu in Nordfrankreich*, and Frademmann, 1904; *Die Entwicklung der latein. Lautverbindung qu im Französischen*. The latter is especially useful. For *aqua* see Fr. Hürlimann's *Die Entwicklung von lat. aqua in den romanischen Sprachen*, 1903.

⁵ This is Paris' etymon (*Romania*, XXII, 617; adopted also by Nyrop) and it seems to me irreproachable. Sheldon, *Harvard Studies and Notes*, I, 121, derived OF *sīte* from *sēcta* (whence *suite*, on the analogy of *suivre*); but OF *sīte* now appears as merely the reduced form of *sīute*, this in turn a variant of *sieute*. Eng. *suit* is, of course, OF *sīute*, the western form, with the later spelling as in *suivre*; cf. the Anglo-Norman *luis* for *lieus*, mentioned below.

⁶ Suchier, § 32, c; the *QLR* have *lieu* (29 times) and *liu* (18 times). The *locus*, quoted by Matzke from Goerlich's *Northwestern Dialects*, p. 48, is of the late thirteenth century and therefore negligible; it seems to be a fusion of *lous* and *leus*, as divergent spellings or forms.

the peculiar sequence dental-velar-palatal-velar-dental, we perceive, with Mr. Tuttle, that it is a distinctly uncomfortable group; central Fr. substituted for it, if I am correct, the easier OF sequence (*ieu-s*) which was just then developing in the large list of words of the type *tu sieus sēquis*, *cieus caecus*, *estrieus*, *fieus*, **fōdu-*, *sieute*, *trieue*, *tieule*, also in *Griecus Graecus*, *Juieus*, *Mathieus*, *Andrieus*, and others as listed by Suchier, § 32a. To avoid **lucius*, **luous* seems to have passed directly to *lieus*. This, in my view, was no phonetic shift of (*u*) to (*i*), to which Mr. Tuttle so vigorously objects, nor an ordinary dissimilation as Meyer-Lübke explains it, nor yet an evidence of (*ū*) in the diphthong (*ue*): it was an out-and-out substitution by analogy to the large *cieus*-group. It has several parallels. In central French we have the later substitution of *tieus* for older *teus* talis, *pieus* for *peus* palus, *Dieus* for *Deus* (see Suchier, *Voyelles toniques*, § 61). Note that this is a Francian, almost a Parisian, phenomenon. The Picard dialect gives an inordinate extension to this (*ieu*), for we find it in *fieus* filius, in *ententieus*, and even in the participles like *eslieus* (for *esleūs*). There is a third and even closer parallel, as has often been pointed out, in the much later series *sueit* sōlet *sueut*, Pic. *sieut*, Champ. *siaut*, and cf. the oft-debated *ueuz*, later *ieus*, now *yeux*.

We had, therefore, very early *lieus* and *gieus*. How stood it with *fōgus*, and *cōgus* from *cōquus*?

The occasional fall of (*u*) after labial consonant is now pretty well assured for OF. Suchier explained *moi mōdium* of the Cassel Glosses as for regular **muoi*, normally later **muei*, *mui*, now *muid*. OF *mōle* *mōla* (in rhyme in Garnier) would represent the ancient *muōle*, normally *muele* as in *Domesday Book*. In my opinion, *foire fōria*¹ also dates from the period of **fupria*, just as *feire* is a similar reduction of **fueire* (*Mod. Phil.*, X, 448). So *ferre* *G. fōdr* in Wace and Villon is to be similarly explained (Meyer-Lübke, *Hist. Frz. Gram.*, § 98). At the stage *fūgus* a reduction (not necessarily universal) to *fōus* was certainly to be expected, and this I (and others) believe leads us to *fou* of the Pic.-Wall. *Ste.-Eulalie* (a new obl. from the nom.) and to *fous* of *Roland*, 3912, 3917. In *cōgus*, *cuous* then *cueus*, the loss of (*u*) after (*k*) is also currently assumed, by Suchier and Meyer-Lübke among others; and it is easy to understand. The doublet OF *cointe* and *cueinte* *cōgnitu* Eng. *quaint* gives us a trustworthy parallel. Hence the *cous* of the *Roland*, 1817, and if elsewhere, as in the oldest *Lapidary* and in the *Roman de Thèbes*, we find *lous* and *jous*, these will be due to the analogy of *fous*, *cous*. It is in fact quite possible that all, or nearly all, of the bewildering variety of forms found in the territory of the ancient *Lugdunensis* will derive in the first instance from one or the other of these two prototypes: *lieus*, *gieus* on the one hand or *fous*, *cous* on the other.

¹ The assumption of (*ō*) in *fōria* by A. Thomas (*Romania*, XXXI, 490) seems to me rather arbitrary; cf. the ancient doublet *fors* and *fuer*. As to *fors* < *fōria*, the received theory of atonic development is not in the least inconsistent with the theory here advanced: *fyp̄ra* > *fyp̄ra*, the extrusion of (*u*) being favored by atonic position.

Wace's *lēus* (: *Deus*), for example, is a by-form of *lieus*, showing a reduction parallel to Garnier's *fēre* for *fiere fēra*. Marie de France, on the other hand, aside from the *focus, cocus* pair, which do not occur in rhyme, has (*iu*) consistently: *lius* (assured already in the *St. Brandan* by the rhyme *lius:pius pius*), *cius*, *Juius* (cf. *Espurg.*, 133, 1915), and from these western forms we have in Eng., as we should expect, *curlew*, *curfew*, the proper names *Kew* (*coquus*), *Jew*, *Andrew*, *Grew* (*Graecus*? or *crōcus*, Prov. *gruec*?) *Drew* *Drōcus*, *Hebrew*, and others. By extrusion of (*u*) between high-front vowel and dental (*s*) we may pass from *lius* to *lis*, cf. *milli* and *gi* instanced by Eggert from the Norman patois (*Zf RP*, XIII, 373), also forms like *corlis* (NED), *site* for *siute*, which show the same change as *aüt* from *aiut* (Paris, *Mélanges linguistiques*, p. 570).

Another secondary formation, from *lius* apparently, is that in *lūs*, *jūs*, *fūs* (Gautier d'Arras, *Brut* of Munich, *Adam*, etc.) in which (*iu*) passes to (*ū*), probably by fusion. As to A-N *luis*, which Menger (§ 26) rightly refused to regard as merely an inverse spelling, it is rather from *lius*, as *suit* from *siut*, *suis* (whence the obl. *suif*) from *sius*, by metathesis of the elements of this very unstable diphthong.

Similarly, reduction of the forms *fous*, *lous* may be expected to furnish at times a nom. *fos*, *los*, obl. *fo*, *lo* as we do in fact find assured by rhyme in the fableau *Des Tresces* (Bartsch-Horning, 622, 33; cf. 621, 22; 303, 30).

Crestien de Troyes, while he has *po pauc* (from obl. pl. *pqs* for *pqus*?) shows the series *feu*, *leu*, *jeu*: do these derive from the type *fous*, or from the type *lieus*?

As to Crestien's forms I do not profess to be at all clear, but the following considerations may be offered. As *lupus lous* does not pass in Crestien to *leus* (cf. *los:nos* Erec, 4412, *los:ros* Yvain, 301) as it does elsewhere (note the interesting reduction nom. pl. *li lé*, *Auc. et Nic.*, 17, 8) and as *pous* does not pass to *peus*; as the (*ieu*) series appear in Crestien as (*eu*): *Greus* and *seut* *sequit* (Foerster's *siut* is questionable), there would seem to be more justification in connecting the Champagne *leus* with the older *lieus*, the triphthong (*ieu*) being apparently foreign to this region; so also *seut* in the contemporary eastern *Dial. An. et Rat.*, and in the *Sermons* of St. Bernard, *Eructavit*, 1016 (Frademann, *op. cit.*, pp. 47-48). At the same time it may be observed that the reduction to *po* may be later than a possible passage of *fqus* to *feus*; the former may be contemporary with the twelfth-century *cpls cōllu-s* *cous* then *cos*, *vqls* **vōlsi* *vous* then *vos*. Moreover, Crestien does not show an unbroken series in (*eu*): he has *estriers* for *estrieus*, so that the situation is mixed.

Still another OF derivative of *lōcus* awaits mention. Benoît, aside from *lieus* and *gieus* (assured by the rhyme *:cieus caelos*), which are central French, has the puzzling rhyme *fuēs fōcus:buēs bōves* *Roman de Troie*, I, 95, noted by Suchier, p. 99. The rare if not unique *fueu* of Sanson de Nanteuil indicates that the loss of (*u*) after (*f*) was not necessarily

universal: Benoit's *fués* seems to be from *fueus* by extrusion of the second (u) after high-front (e) before (s). This constant recourse to "extrusion" of (u) I should perhaps be at some pains to justify; but it is ancient and well authenticated in Latin and Romance. Very old is *Ulixes* from dialectal Ὀλυσσεύς (Lindsay, *Lat. Spr.*, p. 326); to explain *Pharisee* in Eng. we must start from *Pharisés* for *Phariseos* (Sweet, *Collected Papers*, p. 189); Benoit hesitates between *Idomenés* and *Idomeneus*, *Partonopés* and *Partonopeus*, just as Crestien does between *Grés* and *Greus*, *Kés* (the seneschal) and *Keus*.¹ The phenomenon deserves a separate study; it occurs, as Suchier remarked, here and there in almost all the domain of the langue d'oïl (*Auc. et Nic.*⁵, § 17). Confronted then with the unmanageable *lueus* (see above), there were two ways out: one might pass to *lieus* on the one hand, or to *lués* on the other. Just how genuine and how widespread this latter form is, remains to be determined. In any case one is tempted to derive from it as a nominative the obl. *luec*, on the analogy of the pairs *ses siccus*, obl. *sec*, *sas-sac*, *cos-coc*, *bes-bec*. When, however, we consider the state of affairs in a late mediaeval Poitevin text like the *Regle dou Temple* (ed. Curzon), where one may count fifteen instances of *luec*, with *fuec* once, *cuec* and *cuecq*, but also *leuc* four times, *leu* twice, *feu* twice, it seems quite possible that these *luec*-forms may be due to a nom. *leus*.² No one, however, seems ready to derive the *luec*-forms from the Lat. accus. *lōcu*, late VL *lōgo*. Mr. Tuttle will not even admit them as original in Provençal: they are "rejected of men." Such a theory, indeed, must have occurred to many, but strongly against it is the fact that we have (i) from (g) in countless place-names in -acu -ago, -ai (Bavai, Cambrai), in person-names like *DuFay* fagu, and especially in *paugo* from which we should expect *poi*. For *poi* is as good OF as *pou*, *peu* or *po*, and must, I am convinced, derive from *paugo* or *paugi*, or preferably from both: Prov. *pauc d'home saubon*, Fr. *poi d'home sevant* could hardly originate otherwise than from either *paucu* or *pauci*, the uninflected forms. The continuation of Lat. *lōcum*, whatever it was, disappeared too early to be recorded in any text now known.

Still to be mentioned is the adv. *lués*, found frequently in rhyme with *ués* opus. Here we are free from the question of cases, and the flexional -s can make no disturbance. Again Meyer-Lübke's suggestion seems to

¹ Interesting is the problem of the two forms of the name of the Seneschal Sir Kay, but, while the doublet *Keu-Kai* is similar to some of those mentioned in this article, it is probable that the two cases are entirely unconnected. Has it been noted that J. Rhys, *Lectures on Welsh Philology* (pp. 29, 223-24, 390), finds in inscriptions a Celtic name *Iccavos*, *Cauo*, from which he says *Caus* and *Cais*, *Ceis* are possible derivatives? Does *Keus* continue *Caus* as *sarqueus* < **sarquagus*? We may at least be sure that the form *Coi* or *Koi* (*Erec*, 1972: *soi* and often in *Fergus*) is merely the eastern adaptation of western *Kei* = *Kai*.

² Constans eliminated the peculiar *fués* from his text (*Troie*, 1887-88) but had his doubts (see the later Vol. VI, 123). In his text of the *Roman de Thèbes*, 2193-94, by the way, a correction is to be made: the rhyme is not *seis siccus*: *mareis*, but *ses*: *marés*, this last being a well-known variant of *mareis*.

me the correct one (*Hist. Frz. Gram.*³, § 190, end): in *lōc* and **ilōco* (CL ilico) the -c- was never voiced to -g-, the word rhymed early with *hōc*, and hence appeared in OF as *luec*, rhyming with *aruec*, *poruec*, *senuec*. As to *lués*, it stands to this *luec* as *ains* to *ainc*, *dons* to *donc*, -c disappearing as usual before the adverbial -s.

Finally, mod. Fr. *jeu* for older *gieu* (we find *gieus* in rhyme with *vieus* *vētulus* and *tieus* as late as the *Cent Ballades*) exhibits the same normal reduction as OF *abregier* to *abréger*.—T. A. JENKINS.]

OLD FRENCH Dancier

As early as 1869, in the third edition of the *Wörterbuch* and perhaps still earlier, Diez suggested the OHG. *dansōn* as the source of the Romance verb for 'dance.' Körting, *Lat.-Rom. Wörterbuch*, 2392, records Diez's etymon without comment: "Ahd. *dansōn*, 'ziehen'; mutmasslich das Grundwort zu ital. *dansare*, 'tanzen'; prov. *dansar*; frz. *danser*; cat. *dansar*; span. *dansar*, *-zar*; ptg. *dançar*." Diez and Körting, however, took no pains to explain how the meaning of the Germanic word, 'ziehen,' 'draw forth,' developed into that of dancing, nor did they attempt to account for the Romance (*ts*) sound arising out of the Germanic (*s*)¹.

Baist was the first to reject the Germanic etymon, which, according to him, "stützte sich nur auf den Gleichklang, während bei einer solchen Entlehnung doch auch die Bedeutung stimmen müsste. . . . aber auch die Form stimmt nicht; sie lautet afr. *dancier*, nicht *danser*."² Baist, however, found nothing in Latin satisfactory for the form except a hypothetical **DEMPIARE*, which was not convincing for the meaning. "Die Herkunft bleibt dunkel, lateinisch ist für den Laut nur **DEMPIARE* zu haben, und der Gedanke das etwa in der Metallindustrie herausnehmen zu aus-zacken geworden sei wird nicht leicht überzeugen."

Meyer-Lübke, *Rom. Etym. Wörterbuch*, 2562, suggests a hypothetical VL **DENTIARE* "mit Zähnen versehen." He does not, however, insist on it, and goes on to say: "Die Bedeutungsentwicklung von *danser* ist nicht verständlich, doch hilft **DEMPIARE* ZRPh, XXXII, 35 auch nicht weiter; ahd. *danson* 'ziehen' Diez, *Wb.* 117; *Frz. St.* VI, 73 geht lautlich und begrifflich nicht."

It seems to me that the solution of the problem lies in an entirely different direction. There is a Latin adverb which was very frequently used in Vulgar Latin (it is found a number of times in the Reichenau Glosses) and which gave rise in Romance to a number of verbs and adverbs of motion, particularly in combination with a preceding preposition; I refer to *ANTEA*.

¹ In OFr., Prov., and Cat., the word is sometimes spelled with an *s*, especially in derivatives, but cf. also Fr. *garse* with the masc. *gars-garçon*. Everywhere else the form with (*c*) = (*ts*) is the only form found.

² *Ztsch. f. rom. Phil.*, XXXII, 35.

In French the different combinations of ANTEA-plus preposition have resulted in: *avancier* <AB+ANTEA+ARE; *devancier* <DE+AB+ANTEA+ARE; also *davancier*; *avanz*, AB+ANTES; *devanz* <DE+AB+ANTES; *devant*; *avant*, etc. In Italian: *avanzare*; *devanzare*; *davant*; *avanti*; *inanzi*; etc. In Spanish we find, besides these forms, also a form *dante* <DE+ANTE; *adiante*; *denante*; *delantre*; etc. The same is true for Provençal, Portuguese, and Rumanian.

A form or combination of DE+ANTEA+ARE, giving rise to a Vulgar Latin *DANTEARE, naturally suggests itself.

Old French has a number of words applied to dancing: *caroler*, *treschier*, *baler*, *dancier*, etc. We do not know much about all the dances of the Middle Ages: we do know something concerning some of the dances. Thus, we know, more or less, what a *carole* meant. We also have some idea of a certain variety of a *carole* that we may appropriately name "leader dance," in which there were dancing and singing under the guidance of a leader. Says Wechssler: "Diese Bauern führten nach den Berichten einen Ringelreihen (*choraula*) auf, indem sie sich an den Händen fassten und sich in Kreise herumbewegten: es war nach der Beschreibung der Tanz, der frz. *carole*, *ronde* heisst. Ein Vorsänger (*ductor*) stimmte, wie in einer Redaction des Berichts steht, ein Lied an, das begann: *Equitabat Boso/ Per silvam frondosam// ducebat sibi/ Merswindam formosam//*. Die Andern sangen dazu den Refrain: *quid stamus? Cur non imus?*"¹ The large number of refrains quoted by Wechssler, from G. Paris' review of Jeanroy's *Origines de la Poésie lyrique* is by no means exhaustive, and a refrain **danteamus*, <DE+ANTE+EAMUS 'let us step forward,' 'let us follow our leader', seems both plausible and probable. A Vulgar Latin dance-refrain *DANTEAMUS would then be the form to start with: *DANTEAMUS, OFr. *dançons* (**danciens* would naturally, by analogy with all other first persons plural, have become *dançons*); later an infinitive *dancier* was built up on it.²

JOSEPH I. CHESKIS

UNIVERSITY OF IOWA

¹ In Vollmöller's *Krit. Jhb. über die Fortschritte der rom. Phil.*, V, II, 395.

² Professor T. A. Jenkins has called my attention to what may be a similar case of the building of an infinitive on an imperative: *aller* built on *ALLATE (if the etymon is correct) for AMBULATE, as used by the Roman centurions for the command "March!" Cf. also the infin. *laier* (Meyer-Lübke, *Hist. Frz. Gram.*, § 297).

REVIEWS AND NOTICES

L'abbé Du Bos, un initiateur de la pensée moderne, 1670-1740 (viii+1608 pages). *La Correspondance de l'abbé Du Bos* (85 pages). By A. LOMBARD. Paris: Hachette, 1913.

La première partie du XVIII^{me} siècle est une période dont on doit sentir de plus en plus l'importance; c'est celle qui prépare la grande période rationaliste de Voltaire, de Montesquieu, des Encyclopédistes, de Rousseau. Durant ces années de formation, personne—sauf Bayle—n'est plus important que Du Bos. On le savait; mais qui aurait osé, s'il était conscient des exigences de la science moderne, une étude qui supposait des connaissances si universelles? M. Lombard a voulu essayer; et sa tentative s'est justifiée. Son (double) livre est un de ceux auxquels le temps touche peu;—et, soit dit en passant, c'est ce qui fait que nous n'avons pas à nous excuser d'en parler longuement, même après que l'heure de la nouveauté, au sens strict du terme, peut être passée. C'est un livre d'ailleurs dont on ne parle pas après l'avoir rapidement lu; il demande, si on veut lui rendre justice, une lente et patiente absorption. Il a plus de six cents pages d'impression serrée. Et d'abord, il est bourré de faits précis, toujours contrôlés minutieusement; il trahit chez son auteur une connaissance quasi-encyclopédique du XVIII^{me} siècle avant Rousseau; M. Lombard sait être à l'aise dans les questions les plus diverses, en archéologie, en art, en histoire—en histoire surtout—en morale, en théologie, sans compter naturellement la littérature; il est au courant des conditions du commerce de son temps; il connaît les dernières relations des voyageurs et explorateurs; il est documenté sur la question du luxe; il éclaire en passant des sujets vaguement connus, comme les origines de l'opéra en France, . . . et il nous renseigne même sur une institution fort intéressante dont l'abbé Du Bos *eut pu faire* son profit s'il avait vécu un peu plus tard, l'Académie Politique de Colbert de Torcy. Mais M. Lombard n'est pas seulement un érudit; son grand travail abonde en observations pénétrantes; il laisse apercevoir même, à plusieurs reprises, un esprit philosophique vigoureux, qui s'est donné la peine d'approfondir pour lui-même les problèmes discutés. Et en tout cela son livre constitue un très beau témoignage aux méthodes modernes d'histoire littéraire que certains, ne les comprenant pas, ont voulu attaquer.

Louis XIV n'avait pas encore fermé les yeux que l'esprit "libertin," c.à.d. indépendant de la tradition et de l'autorité, se manifestait avec d'autant plus de force qu'il avait été plus longtemps contenu. Il n'était pas besoin de génie, il suffisait d'être intelligent pour s'apercevoir que les dogmes du

grand siècle n'étaient point pour durer; qu'ils n'avaient pas, tant s'en faut, réalisé le millénium.

La formation de la pensée de Du Bos est tellement celle que les conditions rendaient inévitable chez un homme cultivé d'alors qu'en l'étudiant, on voit revivre toute cette période. Tout le labeur formidable de l'abbé aboutit à deux œuvres maîtresses, *les Réflexions critiques sur la Poésie et la Peinture* (1719), et *l'Histoire de l'Établissement de la Monarchie française dans les Gaules* (1734). Comment, d'abord, fut-il amené à concevoir ces œuvres si laïques et si expressives du XVIII^{me} siècle?

Né à Beauvais, le 21 décembre 1670, Du Bos quittait sa ville natale à 16 ans pour Paris, avec l'ambition d'"être chanoine." Ayant l'intelligence ouverte, et de précieuses relations de parenté, il pénétrait rapidement dans la haute société et dans le monde des lettres. Il connut Boileau, Perrault, Malbranche, Huet, Ménage, Nicaise, etc., etc. Et bientôt il goûta, et cultiva l'esprit de salon. Mais dès le début, M. Lombard y insiste avec raison, Du Bos fut mondain dans le sens intellectuel plutôt que dans le sens précieusement sentimental: "Gendron a pu lui reprocher d'avoir, à trente ans, le cœur et les sentiments d'un vieillard. . . . Tout révèle, chez Du Bos, un certain déficit du côté de la sensibilité. Le cerveau, en revanche, était remarquablement organisé, l'esprit curieux et avisé, ouvert à toutes les suggestions et à toutes les nouveautés. . . . Il aime l'historiette," le "détail piquant." Ses relations de société lui rendent bientôt service: en 1693 il est collaborateur des *Menagiana*, ou collections de mots et anecdotes du célèbre grammairien, faite sous la direction de Galland.

En 1695 il fait un séjour à Beauvais où on venait de mettre au jour un monument curieux, le "Mercure barbu"; une inscription (aujourd'hui considérée comme inauthentique) intrigua les érudits. Du Bos se jeta dans la mêlée, y alla de son hypothèse; Galland le réfute du reste, mais c'est un succès que d'avoir été mêlé à cette dispute fameuse.

L'archéologie est une science comme faite exprès pour les abbés dont l'esprit travaille, mais ne doit pas travailler dans les domaines qui touchent aux grandes controverses philosophiques et théologiques. Et par exemple, c'était très "fashionable" en ce moment d'être numismate. Du Bos fut numismate; en la même année 1695 encore, il prenait part à une autre querelle archéologique fameuse; il publie son *Histoire des quatre Gordiens, prouvée et illustrée par les médailles*. L'histoire ne connaît que trois Gordiens, mais tandis que certains font du troisième un fils de Metea Faustina, épouse de Junius Balbus, d'autres le font fils de Gordien II, l'Africain. Du Bos adopte les deux témoignages, et ainsi pose la thèse de l'existence de quatre Gordiens. Cette idée, dit M. Lombard qui n'ignore rien, avait été déjà défendue par Angeloni; mais Du Bos fait valoir un argument nouveau, celui justement des médailles qui fournissent quatre types différents. Il a d'ailleurs le bonheur de se mettre à dos un gros savant, le Hollandais Cuyper.

M. Lombard relève, à juste titre, dans ce vivant travail de jeunesse, certaines idées du Du Bos de l'âge mûr, du Du Bos qui entrevoit, pour le cas de problèmes pratiques, l'importance d'une bonne *méthode*; c'est ainsi que dans sa Préface il déclare hautement qu'il ne considérera pas comme valable une réfutation reposant sur l'argument de la nouveauté de sa thèse; les sciences progressent, et ce qui semblait faux hier, peut aujourd'hui apparaître juste, en suite de faits inconnus amenés à la lumière. Ailleurs, il digresse pour gourmander Le Nain de Tillemont (p. 30) dont l'histoire des empereurs se base constamment sur des témoignages chrétiens acceptés "parcequ'ils sont chrétiens," tandis que les témoignages des païens sont écartés simplement "parcequ'ils sont païens"; sans prendre parti ni pour le miracle chrétien, ni pour le merveilleux mythologique, Du Bos demande aux deux la même garantie d'authenticité.

Du Bos était trop intelligent pour continuer à s'amuser à de vaines querelles d'érudits: La vie l'intéressait de plus en plus. Et, par exemple, il se sent une attraction particulière pour les gens de théâtre, peu orthodoxes peut-être, mais par leur indifférence même aux conventions sociales, morales et intellectuelles, ayant pour lui de la séduction. De fort bonne heure, il s'enthousiasma pour l'opéra (alors au Palais Royal), genre nouveau, qui avait brillé avec Lulli, et qui ne voulait pas mourir avec lui. Les échos de ces années de brillante jeunesse se retrouvent dans les *Réflexions critiques* où l'opéra sera exalté: dès vingt ans, Du Bos "égalait la chorégraphie à la poésie," et "s'intéressait à la destinée des corps de ballet autant qu'à celle de la tragédie française" (p. 44). Et maintenant un heureux hasard met en rapport le jeune abbé avec Bayle: deux esprits faits pour se comprendre. Quelqu'indépendance qu'il faille pour apprécier l'opéra, il y a des choses plus importantes dans la vie. Grâce à Bayle, c'est dès lors "surtout le mouvement des idées qui l'occupe, le progrès de la civilisation et des mœurs—la philosophie au sens que les esprits de la trempe de celui de Bayle et du sien vont bientôt donner à ce mot." Et Du Bos devient une sorte de fournisseur de nouvelles de Paris, faisant pour l'exilé les recherches nécessaires à Paris pour le *Dictionnaire*; il fait rapport sur les polémiques des protestants et des catholiques, des Jésuites et des Jansénistes, des Cartésiens et de leurs adversaires, et sur bien d'autres sujets encore. L'esprit railleur simplement d'antan, l'épigrammatiste d'hier, devient un sceptique raisonné et réfléchi. On voit dans ses lettres à Bayle cette transformation s'opérer: ici c'est l'émancipation des femmes (déplorée par Bernier) qui le fait réfléchir que s'il y a des éléments fâcheux il en résulte des biens qui sont peut-être plus grands; là c'est la question du luxe, que déjà il sait envisager comme Mandeville et Voltaire: on s'affligerait moins de ses désavantages si on comprenait mieux son utilité économique et sociale.

Puis, Du Bos se met à voyager. Avec quelles ressources? Pourquoi? C'est assez difficile à dire, et M. Lombard n'a pas réussi à éclairer tout à fait ce point: Du Bos aura eu l'occasion de rendre quelque service à un person-

nage haut placé; il aura été "chargé d'une de ces missions officielles qui ne laissent pas trace dans les papiers" (p. 71). En tous cas il voyage pendant trois ans en France, en Angleterre, en Hollande, en Italie. . . . Il visite beaucoup de personnages célèbres, surtout en Angleterre: Locke, le naturaliste Lister, le juriste écossais Cunningham, le savant Bentley, peut-être Addison. En Hollande, il vit Bayle. Mais partout, et c'est là que nous saisissons la source de son originalité, il fréquente de préférence les explorateurs, les marins, les commerçants; à Amsterdam il fut admis (rare privilège) à visiter les locaux de la Compagnie des Indes; à Rome il eut la bonne fortune de rencontrer le P. Hennepin, explorateur du Mississippi, qu'il avait en vain cherché à voir en Angleterre.

C'était une aubaine pour un diplomate (et on devenait diplomate par naissance et non par talent) d'avoir les services d'un tel homme. Aussi Du Bos fut recherché. Après avoir servi en qualité de secrétaire privé (qui ne signait pas; ou signait du nom de celui qui le payait—ainsi le *Manifeste de l'Electeur de Bavière*), il fut secrétaire en titre, et assista en personne aux discussions de Neuchâtel (1707), Gertruydenberg (1710), Utrecht et Baden (1712), Rastadt (1714). S'il resta relativement inconnu comme diplomate, et mal payé ce fut entre autres à cause de l'incapacité de son principal patron, le maréchal d'Huxelles. "L'histoire de la carrière diplomatique de Du Bos est l'histoire même de la succession d'Espagne." Nous n'y entrerons pas, mais une fois de plus nous saluerons en passant l'érudition sûre et abondante et claire de M. Lombard, un professeur de littérature, dans un sujet historique d'une effrayante complexité.

Même après Rastadt, en 1714, et quand Du Bos fut retiré à Paris, travaillant à ses *Réflexions critiques*, et vaquant à ses fonctions de Secrétaire perpétuel de l'Académie, son influence dans les affaires d'Etat continue,—au moins indirectement. Le cardinal Du Bois, jusqu'en 1723, eut sans cesse recours à lui (p. 144 et ss.). Ce dernier et illustre patron récompensa enfin assez généreusement ses services. C'est pour Du Bois que notre abbé composa son volumineux *Traité de la Succession à la Couronne*,—qu'il n'acheva pas, mais qui discutait précisément les grandes questions qui passionnent Du Bos dans son *Histoire de l'établissement de la Monarchie Française*, celles du droit naturel et du droit divin des rois.

Passons maintenant à l'examen des deux œuvres de Du Bos qui résument son œuvre de protagoniste des idées nouvelles, aboutissement de cette remuante jeunesse. D'abord, les *Réflexions critiques sur la poésie et sur la peinture*.

L'ouvrage fut mis en vente dans les premiers jours de janvier 1719. Immédiatement il fut célèbre. Il eut 8 éditions françaises jusqu'en 1770; il fut traduit en anglais, hollandais et allemand. Le 23 décembre suivant, Du Bos était élu Académicien, et trois ans après Secrétaire perpétuel.

C'est la tentative d'un esprit, qui s'est tôt et complètement affranchi, de mettre au point, de coordonner ses incessantes réflexions sur des sujets

d'archéologie, de littérature, d'art, et de philosophie,—tentative parallèle à celle du *Dictionnaire* de Bayle quelques années avant, du *Dictionnaire Philosophique* quelques années après. Il est entendu que Du Bos ne sait pas composer, ou plutôt n'a pas le temps de composer (car, nous l'avons vu, ses travaux diplomatiques l'occupent jusqu'en 1723, et ses intérêts si variés l'empêchent de concentrer longtemps son attention sur un même sujet); mais du désordre de son livre, se dégagent cependant quelques idées bien nettes. Indiquons les plus importantes:

1) Et avant tout le critère esthétique. En quelques pages très lumineuses et très documentées, où figurent aux places d'honneur Boileau, Molière, Fontenelle, Lamotte, Perrault, Dacier, Boivin, puis, comme précurseurs en tel ou tel point, Leibnitz, Locke, Bayle, M. Lombard nous explique l'invasion du domaine de l'art par le rationalisme cartésien. A des affirmations comme: "Tout homme qui ne pense pas sur toute matière littéraire comme Descartes prescrit de penser sur les matières physiques, n'est pas digne du siècle présent. Rien ne prépare mieux que les mathématiques à bien juger des ouvrages de l'esprit," ou "Un ouvrage de morale . . . peut-être même d'éloquence, en sera plus beau . . . s'il est fait de main de géomètre," Du Bos oppose le principe absolument contraire de la perception immédiate et directe du beau. Ce "sens esthétique" qu'analysera un jour à son tour Kant, dans sa *Critique du Jugement*, Du Bos l'appelle nettement "le sixième sens,"—et point dans un sens métaphorique puisqu'il en fait une "émotion physique," une réaction des organes analogue au toucher et à l'odorat, un sens nouveau et une nouvelle sensualité. Nous nous demandons toutefois si M. Lombard ne souligne pas un peu trop cette origine "sensualiste" (195 et ss.); Du Bos n'a pas poussé réellement très loin le paradoxe; il dira: "lorsqu'un ouvrage nous a déplu, nous avons le droit de nous demander la raison de cette impression fâcheuse; mais l'esprit ne peut se livrer à cette recherche que pour justifier le jugement que le sentiment a porté." S'il en est ainsi, on ne voit pas comment on pourrait refuser l'adjectif *raisonnable* à la sensation esthétique; et alors l'opposition du sens esthétique de nature sensualiste au sens esthétique de nature psychique cesse d'être aussi tranchante.

2) La seconde idée générale qui se dégage des *Réflexions critiques*, est celle de la relativité de l'art. La sensation esthétique a beau être directe—comme la vue et l'ouïe—elle n'en est pas moins, elle, diverse; et qui plus est—Du Bos ose être conséquent encore—cette diversité a une cause physique également. Les uns ont "l'œil plus voluptueux" et sont plus sensibles au coloris. D'autres préfèrent les "expressions touchantes." Le sens esthétique des habitants du midi et de ceux du nord, peut réagir différemment, celui de l'antiquité peut différer de celui du moyen-âge. Tout est ramené à ce grand principe de la science moderne: l'expérience. On ne nie pas l'expérience.

Et en ce point—la relativité de la suggestion d'art, par opposition à l'absoluité qu'elle devrait avoir s'il était affaire de raisonnement—Du Bos est

plus de son siècle que par l'autre, le sensualisme esthétique. "Sa critique sera non plus dogmatique et absolue, mais relative et historique" (197). N'a-t-il pas anticipé, et appliqué à l'esthétique, la théorie du climat dont on fait honneur à Montesquieu? "Là précisément est la nouveauté du système de Du Bos: chez lui l'esthétique littéraire est liée non seulement à l'esthétique générale, mais à la science de l'homme et de la société" (p. 189; cf. p. 243 ss.).¹

Toutefois il faut préciser. Et voici bien Du Bos, le scrupuleux; il pose le principe *Expérience*: "Nous nous attendrions donc à ce que le public fût la foule même." Or il n'en est rien, et dès l'abord Du Bos réduit le "public" à une élite: "Je ne comprends point le bas peuple dans le public capable de se prononcer sur les poèmes ou sur les tableaux. . . . Le mot de public ne renferme ici que les personnes qui ont acquis des lumières, soit par la lecture soit par le commerce du monde" (p. 233). Mais justement qu'est ce que ces "lumières"? En fin de compte, il laisse la question ouverte: "Le sentiment dont je parle est dans tous les hommes; mais comme ils n'ont pas tous les oreilles et les yeux également bons, de même ils n'ont pas tous le sentiment également parfait" (p. 233). Tout ce qu'il ajoute, c'est qu'il faut donner au public le temps de réviser son jugement:—mais rien n'est là pour prouver que le public révisera dans le bon sens. Du Bos croit pouvoir fixer à deux ou trois ans le temps nécessaire pour arriver à un jugement définitif.

3) Du Bos s'est laissé entraîner à fausser en quelque sorte fondamentalement son examen de la nature de la sensation esthétique: il identifie en effet les impressions d'art aux impressions de pathétique—comme s'il n'y avait de plaisir esthétique qu'en rapport avec la souffrance. Ce n'est pas cependant une des idées essentielles de Du Bos; peut-être M. Lombard aurait-il pu l'indiquer mieux, et faire comprendre que cette digression n'est là qu'en suite du souci de Du Bos de résoudre les problèmes esthétiques traditionnels; il y avait la fameuse théorie d'Aristote, de l'art qui purge les passions; et Du Bos, qui s'est si bien affranchi des Cartésiens, ne s'est pas affranchi d'Aristote—car c'est lui, Aristote, qui avait enchaîné, bien avant Du Bos, l'esthétique à cette association de l'art avec passion dans le sens de souffrance. La théorie de Du Bos quant à l'interprétation d'Aristote, est celle des "émotions superficielles," c.à.d. l'émotion d'art est une émotion de sympathie pour un objet qui n'en a pas besoin: derrière *Le Cid* il n'y a pas de réalité (qui serait pénible), pas plus que derrière le groupe de Laocoon. Le XVIII^{me} siècle tout entier fera sienne cette théorie: "C'est bien à Du Bos que l'ont empruntée en France, Mallet, Louis Racine, Batteux, d'Alembert, Marmontel; en Angleterre, Burke et Hume; en Suisse et en Allemagne, Du Bos

¹ Il ne faut du reste pas en faire tout à fait honneur à Du Bos (pp. 245-47); elle était appliquée par les médecins déjà depuis longtemps: "Le docteur Venel, dans l'*Encyclopédie*, disait en phrases polies que si Montesquieu s'était douté combien ces idées sur le climat et la température étaient familières aux médecins, il se serait borné à les indiquer sans s'aventurer dans des théories scientifiques aussi étrangères à ses études" (253). Mais certes Du Bos a appliqué le principe dans le domaine esthétique avant que Montesquieu le fit dans celui des lois et de la politique.

a fourni à peu près tout ce que Bodmer et surtout Breitinger, puis Mendelssohn, ont dit de la tragédie. Lessing lui-même—les historiens allemands l'ont reconnu—doit aux *Réflexions critiques* l'essentiel de sa théorie dramatique" (p. 208).

4) On ne voit nulle part plus clairement la valeur de l'œuvre critique de Du Bos que dans l'attitude que son souci des faits lui a dictée dans la Querelle des Anciens et des Modernes. Nous nous ferions un reproche de ravir à ce chapitre si rempli et si clair, son ampleur en l'étriquant par le choix de quelques citations et théories. Disons seulement qu'il fait comprendre fort bien comment Du Bos, lui-même un Moderne, devait cependant logiquement tomber à bras raccourcis sur un groupe très considérable de Modernes,—ceux qui basaient leur opposition aux Anciens sur ce que ceux-ci n'exprimaient pas des sentiments et des idées acceptables au XVIII^{me} siècle. Selon le principe de relativité du sentiment esthétique, c'était absurde et il met le doigt sur le malentendu qui rendait sans issue le débat tel qu'il se poursuivait: "Les discours des héros d'Homère à leurs chevaux révoltent notre délicatesse. Mais les Orientaux ne sont pas des Cartésiens et ne professent pas le même mépris pour les animaux" (p. 262). D'autre part, Du Bos s'élève avec non moins de décision et de bon sens contre ces pseudo-Modernes qui, par exemple, excusaient en quelque sorte leur goût pour le genre très "moderne" de l'Opéra en s'appuyant sur l'argument saugrenu que l'opéra est une renaissance du théâtre antique, où l'on chantait la tragédie (pp. 283 ss.). L'opéra n'a besoin d'aucune justification que le goût du public moderne. (En passant il discute de la façon la plus suggestive le vrai caractère de la déclamation chez les Anciens, et de la saltation qui n'était pas la danse, pp. 284-90.)

Et maintenant, il faut bien le dire, l'ouvrage de Du Bos vaut autant par les vues de détail et les petites thèses en marge—comme celles de l'opéra—que par les grandes vues auxquelles nous avons ici donné la première place. En somme, son grand mérite est d'avoir mis en branle la discussion; sa vaste érudition, son choix habile de petits faits révélateurs, et ses opinions volontiers paradoxales, ont été un stimulant indiscutable. Le juste et le contestable sont mêlés de façon singulièrement pittoresque et provocatrice de débats. Voici par exemple sa théorie du vers (et à ce propos encore on observera que Du Bos n'était pas du tout toujours du côté des casse-cou): Il prend parti pour les vers contre les détracteurs Lamotte et Pons; et son argument est physiologique: "un bruit mesuré" est agréable à l'oreille; il n'en faut pas davantage pour réfuter les prosateurs à tous crins. Cependant Du Bos médit de la rime, et là on comprend moins. Si les Anciens n'ont pas eu besoin de la rime, très bien; mais puisque de grands écrivains français l'ont employée avec succès, en faut-il davantage pour la justifier aux yeux de Du Bos? Pour le XVII^{me} siècle en tous cas "le bruit de la rime" était agréable; Du Bos a-t-il autorité pour parler au nom de ses contemporains?

Citons aussi la thèse du génie. Du Bos n'a vraiment pas peur; après avoir rattaché la perception du beau à un sens esthétique d'ordre physiologique, il se fait précurseur de Cabanis, Comte et Taine en déclarant que le génie créateur lui-même n'est qu'affaire de matière: "Je conçois que le génie consiste dans un arrangement heureux des organes du cerveau, dans la bonne conformation de chacun des organes, comme la qualité, du sang laquelle le dispose à fermenter durant le travail" (p. 239); et ailleurs: "Le génie est une plante qui pousse d'elle-même" (p. 240); le corollaire ne manque pas non plus: Pour que le génie puisse s'épanouir, il faut des circonstances matérielles favorables de milieu, de prospérité économique, d'absence de guerre, etc. Mais Du Bos accepte les conséquences de ses idées... jusqu'à l'étrange; les pays froids ne produisent rien en fait d'art; les pays d'orient non plus; l'orientalisme de Galland et autres n'est qu'une mode; il n'y a pas d'art vraiment dans la porcelaine de la Chine et du Japon! Aussi, il y a des siècles stériles, pour des raisons économiques ou politiques; par exemple—dit le malheureux—le siècle des Médicis à Florence et celui des Sforza à Milan!

Tout cela peut être faux; c'est toujours intéressant; on sent le besoin constant de ne pas affirmer, mais de comprendre, comprendre plutôt mal que tomber juste par hasard.

"Les livres de Du Bos sont de ceux après lesquels il y a quelque chose de changé" (p. 314) dit excellemment M. Lombard. Nous ne le suivrons pas dans son voyage d'exploration au travers des XVIII^{me} et XIX^{me} siècles, en France, puis en Angleterre, en Amérique, en Hollande—retrouvant partout Du Bos avec une sagacité et une patience inlassables. Mais ce grand travail profitera aux érudits qui chercheront les inspirations de Louis Racine, Montesquieu, Voltaire et les philosophes, Burke, Lessing, Mendelssohn, etc., etc.—et jusqu'à Taine qui cependant ne connaissait pas Du Bos, et où le rapport est indirect.¹

Pourquoi Du Bos n'a-t-il pas eu plus de renommée, ou plutôt, pourquoi, après avoir donné une impulsion si profonde aux idées esthétiques, a-t-il été oublié? Nous le savons déjà, et M. Lombard en demeure tout à fait d'accord: Parce qu'il n'avait pas l'art—"le style," comme disait Buffon, et que dès lors il a été supplanté par ceux-la même qu'il avait souvent enrichis de ses idées. On peut appeler cela une prodigieuse injustice;—mais on ne saurait y voir quelque chose d'anormal; il est bien naturel que les générations suivantes se familiarisent avec une idée, ou un sujet de roman ou de théâtre, non chez l'écrivain qui l'a le premier exprimé, mais chez celui qui l'a le mieux exprimé.

L'œuvre historique de Du Bos, *L'Histoire critique de l'Établissement de la Monarchie française dans les Gaules* (3 volumes, in 4°; 1784), est probablement aussi importante que son œuvre critique; mais comme elle ne touche que par certains points à la littérature, nous serons plus brefs.

¹ Relevons les pages importantes sur Batteux et Du Bos, pp. 322-26, Montesquieu, pp. 326-27; et sur l'Encyclopédie, pp. 339-43. Et l'Appendice I.

D'abord, pour apprécier vraiment cette œuvre, il convient de se rendre compte que Du Bos fut déjà un historien au sens moderne de ce mot; et qu'il était bien en avance de son temps (comme Bayle son maître) quand il formulait consciencieusement ces trois règles: (1) indiquer ses références, (2) fonder ses affirmations sur des déclarations de contemporains, (3) avertir le lecteur si on n'a pas de source de première main. Du Bos s'excusait du reste du style encombrant que cette méthode imposait, mais il osait trouver le style et l'agrément moins importants que la vérité bien établie (p. 395). Il nous est difficile aujourd'hui de nous représenter qu'une conception subjective de l'histoire non seulement prévalut avant, mais encore après Du Bos; l'histoire devait donner des leçons de morale, et si l'histoire ne contribuait pas "à l'amélioration des mœurs," la lecture d'un roman bien fait "vaut beaucoup mieux," dira encore Madame de Genlis; du livre de Mably sur *La Manière d'écrire l'histoire*, il résulte que l'inexactitude est le premier devoir de l'historien (p. 390): Voltaire, l'auteur de *Charles XII*, concevait que la vérité historique devait parfois être couverte. Il est à peine besoin de dire que Du Bos écartait—comme le font aujourd'hui autant que possible les moins positivistes des historiens,—toute explication providentielle des faits, ne cherchant que "dans les faits, la raison des faits" (p. 401).

Est-ce à dire que Du Bos ait été conséquent, et ait appliqué sa méthode rigoureusement? Non pas: mais quel écrivain, même le plus moderne, a réussi absolument à demeurer objectif? Taine, à la fin du XIX^{me} siècle, l'était-il? S'il faut se souvenir que d'une part, c'est le fait d'avoir pris part aux grands démêlés diplomatiques de son temps qui avait convaincu Du Bos de la nécessité de l'histoire *objective*—il avait été arrêté constamment par des assertions sans preuves, ou par manque de documents probants—, il faut se souvenir aussi d'autre part que dans les dernières années de sa carrière diplomatique le cardinal Du Bois l'avait fait travailler sur la question des droits respectifs de la royauté et de la noblesse, et que son grand ouvrage, qui lui mérita le nom de "Père du Romanisme," fut écrit avec cette préoccupation d'un *problème*.

M. Lombard nous rappelle toute l'histoire du Romanisme avant Du Bos, c. à. d. lorsqu'il celui-ci cessa d'être un problème théorique. Rappelons seulement que les deux thèses en présence étaient: la thèse dite *féodale*, selon laquelle la France moderne est une nation franque, de Clovis et de ses compagnons d'armes, et qui s'est substituée à la Gaule, province Gallo-romaine; et la thèse dite *romaniste*, selon laquelle la France monarchique n'est qu'une continuation, et quasi un développement naturel, de l'impérialisme romain; et l'invasion barbare ne constituerait alors, au point de vue du droit, qu'un accident sans grande importance; supposé que les Francs n'eussent pas pénétré en Gaule, la France moderne ne serait guère différente de ce que nous la voyons.

Boulainvilliers, noble, et opposé aux grandissantes prérogatives de la royauté, fit servir la première thèse à soutenir les droits de sa classe (*Histoire*

de France avant Clovis, 1727, *Essai sur la Noblesse* 1732): "On ne se souvient plus—dit-il—que dans l'origine Clovis n'était que le général d'une armée libre. Le Français ne doit à ses rois ni sa liberté, ni ses possessions, ni l'indépendance de sa personne, et les Gaulois asservis ne furent pas sujets du roi, mais des guerriers francs. Ceux-ci étaient tous égaux, et il existait entre eux et les Gaulois une distinction formelle telle que du maître à l'esclave. Il n'y avait plus que des conquérants et des conquis. Les Français étaient exempts de toutes les charges; ils avaient le droit de juger leurs pareils et de n'être jugés que par eux, le droit de défendre leur personne dans des guerres particulières, même contre leur roi. La convocation insolite, sous Philippe le Bel, des Etats Généraux, où, du moins au début, le tiers n'assistait que pour promettre d'obéir; l'invention inouïe du droit royal de justice; l'usage monstrueux des anoblissements, qui a permis aux hommes de s'élever insolemment, ont été les étapes de la dégradation de la noblesse" (pp. 418-19). Mais bien vite, en 1734, Du Bos oppose dans son *Histoire critique*, aux prétentions de la noblesse la thèse romaniste. Infiniment plus érudit que Boulainvilliers, il *prouve* que les Francs n'ont pas supprimé les institutions et les cadres de la nation des Gaules; il déclare qu'il n'est dit nulle part que les Francs aient réduit en servitude les Gallo-Romains; et il défie de démontrer par l'histoire que les Francs se soient réservé exclusivement la profession des armes. Et une fois lancé, Du Bos ne s'arrête plus, il veut établir encore que la monarchie des rois de France est plus grande, plus morale, que celle de Rome même qu'elle continue. La souveraineté impériale en effet, était instable et livrée au hasard de la force, mais la monarchie française en adoptant le principe d'hérédité, écarta cet arbitraire—partant, les causes de lutte et de désordre.

En somme la théorie de Du Bos opposée à celle de Boulainvilliers, qui accusait les Valois d'avoir violé les droits des nobles, revient à ceci: "Il est vrai qu'il y a eu en France conquêtes et usurpations, mais voici où elles se placent. Ce fut, lorsque les ducs et comtes, s'emparèrent des droits du roi et de ceux de la nation, s'instituèrent seigneurs héréditaires dans leurs bénéfices militaires et substituèrent aux lois romaines des lois dictées par le caprice et l'insolence" (p. 457). Il ne nous appartient pas ici de prononcer entre Boulainvilliers et Du Bos. Mais il est certain que, même si la thèse de Du Bos n'est pas beaucoup plus franche de prévention que celle de son adversaire, son livre n'en garde pas moins une plus grande valeur; Du Bos a placé la discussion sur le terrain scientifique; il va aux documents; et même ceux qui interpréteront ces documents autrement que lui—amis ou ennemis—c'est chez Du Bos qu'ils iront puiser le meilleur de leurs renseignements; les plus originaux apporteront peu de vraiment nouveau (p. 459).

Nous ne nous arrêterons pas aux pages si riches de renseignement montrant la fortune de l'œuvre de Du Bos depuis le jour de sa publication jusqu'à nos jours. Les consciencieuses recherches de M. Lombard seront

énormément utiles, car rien ne semble échapper à sa curiosité. Mais, résumer serait gâter, apprécier d'un point de vue critique ne serait possible qu'après avoir refait l'immense labeur de l'auteur.

Citons cependant : (1) le chapitre remarquable sur Montesquieu (pp. 469-74) qui a été peu généreux à Du Bos, lequel avait été très nettement son précurseur en idées—bien que sûrement pas en qualité littéraire; en tous cas s'il ne le fut pas dès le début, il *devint* son créancier. Ce seul chapitre représente une étude minutieuse de l'œuvre de Montesquieu; M. Lombard discute la connaissance de Du Bos par Montesquieu, non seulement dans les diverses éditions de *L'Esprit des Lois*, mais dans la *Grandeur et Décadence des Romains*. C'est un triste spectacle de voir cet homme illustre traiter d'abord avec mépris Du Bos, puis refondre un de ses ouvrages en se servant de ce même Du Bos; et ignorant sa dette, et ne trouvant pas une parole pour effacer le tort qu'il avait fait par un jugement sommaire de sa plume autorisée. Heureusement que Gibbon réhabilita pour un temps Du Bos, dont l'étoile était bien pâlie déjà. (2) Le chapitre sur Fustel de Coulanges. Du Bos avait été éliminé de la grande célébrité une première fois par Montesquieu; il le fut une seconde fois par Fustel de Coulanges pour une autre partie de son œuvre. Et dans les deux cas c'est l'art qui a prévalu sur l'érudition. C'est la théorie romaniste de Du Bos, qui presque oubliée pendant un bon siècle aboutit au livre prodigieux, *Histoire des Institutions politiques de l'ancienne France* (1875). Mais le problème se complique un peu ici. F. de Coulanges a pensé s'affranchir d'emblée de toute dette envers ses prédécesseurs en déclarant vouloir toujours remonter aux sources. En ce faisant, il a abouti à la thèse romaniste qu'il a seulement exprimée d'une façon plus dogmatique que Du Bos. Peut-on le nommer le disciple de Du Bos? Evidemment non. . . . Et cependant, pour ceux qui veulent être équitables, Du Bos est victime. D'autant plus que c'est Du Bos qui par son œuvre a jeté en quelque sorte dans le domaine public ces sources; et alors on a le droit de se demander si F. de Coulanges eût connu tout ce qu'il a connu au cas où Du Bos n'eût pas existé un siècle et demi avant. Et, qui plus est, M. Lombard, qui reste d'une parfaite équité, nous dit que Fustel de Coulanges a lu Du Bos après coup, et a ajouté, sans chercher à ce qu'on le sût trop, de l'érudition de Du Bos à la sienne.

Nous ne pouvons terminer sans un mot sur les rapports du romanisme avec les idées sociales du XVIII^{me} siècle. Du Bos, à première vue, est déconcertant. Partout ailleurs il est en avance sur son temps, et justement pour l'organisation sociale, c. à. d. dans la question *pratique* du XVIII^{me} siècle, celle qui trouve sa tentative de solution dans la Révolution, le voici qui non seulement n'accorde pas de droits au peuple, mais les refuse à la noblesse même, et plaide pour l'absolutisme royal de Louis XV.

Il est trop érudit pour ignorer les juristes qui ont affirmé déjà, comme Grotius, la théorie des droits naturels du peuple à disposer de lui-même; mais il concilie cela avec sa conception de l'absolutisme royal en invoquant

la prescription: le peuple s'est donné librement au roi et c'est trop tard maintenant pour s'en dédire. Il y a sûrement un malentendu quelque part; l'appel à la prescription sonne faux, laisse l'impression d'une mauvaise excuse à laquelle on a recours, soit pour prendre la place d'un vrai argument qu'on n'a pas, soit parce qu'on n'a pas bien saisi le problème. Ici c'est certainement un exemple du second cas. Quelqu'avancé et indépendant que fût du Bos, il n'était cependant pas arrivé à concevoir encore que le peuple pût *réellement* compter en politique. La *Monarchie Française* est de 1834; le *Contrat Social*, où la *Souveraineté Populaire* est discutée sérieusement, ne vient qu'en 1760, et les *Observations sur l'Histoire de France* de Mably sont de 1765. Il fallut donc, après 1734, même aux esprits radicaux comme Rousseau, un bon quart de siècle avant de songer que le Tiers-Etat pût être pris en considération. Et cependant Du Bos ne fut pas réactionnaire en contestant les droits des nobles; seulement il n'alla qu'à mi-chemin; il vit que les privilèges de naissance étaient une injustice, puis, ne songeant pas au peuple, il les rendit à la royauté; il *parut* réactionnaire, de fait il n'était que paradoxal, puisqu'il proposait un remède pire que le mal: combattant un système de privilèges sociaux (noblesse) par un système de privilèges encore plus accusés (le roi). Enfin on rappellera avec à propos que quand Rousseau qui, lui, crut au peuple, réclama pour le peuple ses droits et vit toutes les théories de la Révolution, il s'arrêta net devant la pratique et fut aussi prudent que Montesquieu et Voltaire: le coût de la révolution sociale, en désordres et en vies, ne vaudrait pas les résultats. Il fallut attendre trente ans encore après la publication du *Contrat social* que les hommes de la Révolution dissent: réalisons la théorie de la souveraineté populaire.

Notre explication nous paraît plus juste que celle à laquelle s'arrête M. Lombard. Il explique Du Bos ainsi: "l'expérience" de l'histoire enseignait que la monarchie assurait plus d'ordre que l'oligarchie. En fût-il ainsi, il resterait toujours que Du Bos n'a pas tenu compte de la souveraineté populaire dont "l'expérience" ne pouvait rien dire puisqu'elle n'avait pas été faite.

ALBERT SCHINZ

SMITH COLLEGE

Dante. By C. H. GRANDGENT. New York: Duffield & Co., 1916.
Pp. 397. Price, \$1.50 net.

In preparing this volume on Dante for the new series called "Master Spirits of Literature," Professor Grandgent faced the problem of avoiding the mere repetition of material already presented many times in similar form. He solves it by introducing Dante, not as an individual, but as a representative of his age. He gives the biographical facts in one short chapter, perhaps less fully than in the Introduction to his edition of the *Divina Commedia*, a model

of concise and comprehensive statement. Then follow a dozen chapters on various aspects of mediaeval civilization, with quotation of the significant passages from the works of Dante in connection with the subjects to which they are related. Thus it is shown how Dante more than any other man represents a period in the world's history, and particularly in this sense is a master-spirit. Two other Dante books of 1916 are quite distinct in purpose and result. Professor Fletcher's *Dante* contains, first, an exposition of a certain theory of interpretation, and secondly, literary criticism; Professor Brooks' *Dante: How to Know Him* is mostly a simple account of the *Divina Commedia*, canto by canto. Professor Grandgent makes no claim to novelty except in the method of presentation. He gives a brief bibliography and an index, but no footnotes; and he assumes no knowledge on the part of the reader of any language other than English. The book does, however, bespeak that intelligent interest in serious subjects without which no one should approach the study of Dante. It is a good thing for the general reader and the student alike that so competent a scholar has taken the time for a work of this character.

The arbitrary division into chapters occasionally involves repetition; thus "Society and Politics" is logically connected with "Church and State," and "Language and Poetry" may be considered a part of the general subject of "Medieval Song." There are abundant interesting comments and suggestions. Perhaps the most useful portion of the book is the chapter on "Allegory." Some comparisons between Dante's age and the present recall the author's memorable presidential address on "The Dark Ages"; and his sympathy with what he calls "the medieval temper" admirably fits him to be the interpreter of Dante. He introduces no controversy on disputed points, and gives information which will be generally accepted as orthodox. For instance, while he evidently still inclines to Flamini's system of interpretation, he does not present the disputed theories as facts. Thus in regard to the three beasts of *Inf. I*, he says merely (p. 352): "They represent the evil habits which prevent the sinner from regaining cleanness by his unaided effort"; and in the discussion of allegory, he implies (p. 273) that they "perhaps" represent immoderateness, violence, and deceit. Of errors there are practically none; the statement (p. 17) that the *Convivio* contains five books is an unfortunate slip. The explanation of Dante's definition of the "Sweet New Style" is quite inadequate: the dictation of *Amore* does not show itself merely in "direct, sincere expression of feeling" (p. 136); that is too simple a statement of a very complicated matter.

An interesting feature is Professor Grandgent's translation in the rhyme and meter of the original of most of the passages quoted. His rendering of some lyrics earlier than Dante's time is particularly welcome. The English reads smoothly, and is doubtless as faithful to the meaning as the use of an elaborate rhyme-scheme will permit; an attempt to reproduce the form necessarily sacrifices some of the substance. Thus in the following passage

the rhyme hardly compensates for the divergence of wording (p. 299; *Inferno*, XIII, 7-9):

The savage beasts have forests none so thick,
Those beasts which hate each cultivated spot
In moist Maremma's lonesome bailiwick.

This is barely recognizable in the literal version of Longfellow:

Such tangled thickets have not, nor so dense,
Those savage wild-beasts, that in hatred hold
"Twixt Cecina and Corneto the tilled places.

It would be easy to multiply examples of inappropriate words used solely on account of the rhyme. In the case of Dante, prose or blank verse seems on the whole a better medium for translation. Nevertheless, Professor Grandgent's attempt is interesting and often felicitous; one of the most successfully translated passages is the final canto of *Paradiso*, with which his book closes.

KENNETH MCKENZIE

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

Italia dialettale. BY G. BERTONI. Milano: Ulrico Hoepli, 1916.

Students of Italian dialects should be greatly pleased at the recent appearance in the Hoepli series of this excellent book by Sig. Bertoni, which presents in compact form noteworthy contributions to the subject. The work is divided into three parts: I, "Lexicology," II, "Principal phonetic and Morphological Characteristics of the Dialects," III, "Syntactical Features." There is also a short appendix dealing with "Italian Dialectic Colonies."

The "Lexicology" is of unusual interest. First, the sources of dialectic words are discussed, then their occasional changes of meaning and migration from one dialect to another. Finally, we have a geographical division into dialect groups.

The writer classifies non-Latin words into the following groups: those of obscure origin, Italic, Celtic, Germanic, Greek, Arabic, French, and Spanish. Among the words of obscure origin are mentioned several which are "pre-Romance" and "non-Latin," and consequently are classed as remnants of older languages which have disappeared. Several words from the Italic dialects are mentioned, some being good Italian, as *tufo*. In discussing these the writer makes the statement that they are easily detected by the presence of inter-vocalic *f* for Latin *b*, or by non-Latin suffixes. To the student who is acquainted with Oscan and Umbrian, no explanation of this is necessary, but it is hardly safe to assume that everyone who will read Sig. Bertoni's book has studied the Italic dialects, and a word of explanation would not have been out of place.

The Celtic words came into the vocabulary at an early date, and are, as is to be expected, especially numerous in the dialects of the north, although a great many of them have also found their way into literary Italian. Words of Germanic origin are also especially common in this region, and the literary language has a goodly number of them. It is often impossible to determine whether a word came into the vernacular from the Gothic or through the Lombard. In some cases, however (when we are dealing with words which have been differentiated from their earlier forms by the second Germanic sound-shift), we can distinguish whether the word has been borrowed from the Gothic or the Lombard. It. *biotto*, Lomb. *biot*, "lacking," "without," is certainly of Gothic origin, as appears from the preservation of *t*, while Emilian *bioss*, "nude," comes from the ancient Lombard form *blausz*. So also *tappo* is Gothic, while *zaffo* is Lombard. Germanic words in general may be divided into five principal groups or strata: (1) words, such as *borgo*, brought in before Romance differentiation (recognizable by the fact that they remained in all the Romance languages except Roumanian); (2) words of Gothic origin; (3) Lombard words; (4) words which came in later with the advent of the emperors; (5) modern words, such as *valzer*.

The Greek element, which is well represented in the literary language, is especially strong in the southern dialects and in those along the Adriatic as far north as Venice. Arabic words are not numerous in literary Italian, but occur in Sicilian and other southern dialects, and occasionally in Genoese.

During the thirteenth century the French influence was almost entirely literary. Many French and Provençal words were adopted, often in a slightly Italianized form, by the poets and even the prose writers, but with the decline of French literary influence most of these words disappeared. The Normans, however, left traces of their language in the southern dialects, while the Piedmontese, because of their geographic position, have borrowed much from the French. In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, also, on account of close relations with France, both the literary language and the dialects have taken over many words. Spanish influence is to be noted especially in the southern districts, although there are some traces in the northern parts. It is not anterior to the fifteenth century and most of the borrowings were made during the sixteenth and seventeenth. There are also a few words from various other sources, such as Flemish, English, Persian, Turkish, American, Indian, etc.

Some of the changes of meaning studied by Sig. Bertoni are very interesting. The Modenese word for "flatiron" is *pās*, the reason probably being that it has the form of those relics called *paci* which in the churches are given to the faithful to kiss.

The dialects are divided geographically into four groups: (1) Italo-Gallo-Ladin, (2) Venetian, (3) central, and (4) southern. The chapter upon the Italo-Gallo-Ladin dialects is especially complete and satisfactory. In the section on the Venetian dialects the writer points out some striking

resemblances between the older dialects of the Veneto and Ladin, and discusses the connections between the two. The central dialects are not as exhaustively treated as those of Northern Italy. It is to be regretted that the writer has passed over the Livornese in silence; the rest of the territory is, however, well covered. The Corsican, spoken by about two-thirds of the population of the island, is really the cismontano, the oltremontano being ascribed to the Sardinian system. The southern dialects, Neapolitan, Abruzzese, Calabro-Sicilian, Pugliese, are unfortunately all grouped together. It would have been better if a separate chapter had been devoted to each of these headings.

In the chapter dealing with syntax, *ipse* as an article, the position of personal pronoun objects, the intensive *sic* with verbs, and the use of *a* before a direct object referring to a specific person, are of special interest.

In writing this book Sig. Bertoni has done a great service to all students of Italian dialects. It may truthfully be said that it contains more useful information than has ever before been put into one volume on the subject. It is to be regretted that it was impossible to include a series of charts which might have made more clear the exact districts covered by a given phenomenon, but, especially in the chapter on the Italo-Gallo-Ladin, the information is so clearly and definitely presented that it may be possible for the painstaking reader to construct his own charts with a fair degree of accuracy.

HERBERT H. VAUGHAN

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

